## WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME I

Pike's Landing Fairbanks, Alaska October 10, 2017 9:04 a.m.

## COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jack Reakoff, Chairman Fred Alexie Ray Collins Timothy Gervais Don Honea Jenny Pelkola Pollock Simon Dennis Thomas Darrel Vent

Regional Council Coordinator, Zach Stevenson

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

32 33 34

1 2 3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24 25

26

27 2.8 29

30 31

35 36 37

38

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Jenny. Welcome and introductions. There's lots of staff here and I'd like to go around the room and give introductions for who's attending the meeting.

39 40 41

42 43

Lisa.

44 45

MS. MAAS: Lisa Maas, wildlife biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management.

46 47 48

MR. MATHEWS: Vince Mathews, Subsistence Coordinator for Kanuti, Arctic and Yukon

49 50 Fred Alexie.

Page 4 Flats and Fairbanks. 1 2 MS. MICKLEY: Julia Mickley, Northern 3 Alaska Environmental Center. Water and mining 4 5 coordinator. 6 7 MR. SIMON: Jim Simon, private 8 anthropologist. 9 10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. 11 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, Bureau 12 13 of Indian Affairs, subsistence anthropologist out of 14 Anchorage. 15 16 MS. DAMBERG: Carol Damberg.... 17 MR. DAVIS: Arlo Nasruk Davis, Northern 18 Alaska Environmental Center as the conservation 19 2.0 coordinator. 21 22 MS. LOR: My name is Socheata Lor. the Deputy Regional Chief of Refuges in Anchorage, 23 Alaska. 2.4 25 MS. DAMBERG: My name is Carol Damberg. 26 I'm the Regional Subsistence Coordinator out of 27 2.8 Anchorage. 29 30 MS. OKADA: Good morning. My name is Marcy Okada. I'm a subsistence coordinator for Gates 31 of the Arctic National Wildlife Center. 32 33 34 MS. TRAINOR: Hello. My name is Alida 35 I'm a Subsistence Resource Specialist in the 36 Division of Subsistence at Fish and Game here in Fairbanks. 37 38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This fellow in the 39 front there. 40 41 42 MR. HASBROOK: Mark Hasbrook (ph) just 43 as an observer. 44 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. 46 47 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Carl Johnson and 48 I'm the Council Coordination Division Chief with the 49 50

Office of Subsistence Management. Good to see you all 1 2 here. 3 Good morning. 4 MR. REAM: I'm Joshua 5 Ream, anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence 6 Management. 7 8 MR. KEYSE: Matt Keyse. I'm with the 9 Subsistence Branch here in the Fairbanks Office, Fish and Wildlife Service. 10 11 MS. JULIANUS: Good morning. 12 Julianus, wildlife biologist for BLM Central Yukon 13 Field Office. 14 15 JASON: Jason (indiscernible), Central 16 17 Yukon BLM Field Office. 18 MS. PARKER MCNEILL: I'm Doreen Parker 19 2.0 I'm with Fish and Game. I'm the management coordinator for the Wildlife Division. 21 22 MS. CONITZ: Good morning. 23 I'm with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service here 24 in Fairbanks with the Subsistence Division. 25 26 MS. RATTENBURY: Good morning. 27 I'm an ecologist with the National 2.8 Kumi Rattenbury. Park Service and the Arctic Network Inventory 29 30 Monitoring Program. 31 32 MR. BUE: Good morning. Fred Bue, U.S. 33 Fish and Wildlife Service, fisheries manager. 34 35 MR. HAVENER: Good morning. 36 Havener. I'm the Refuge Subsistence Coordinator for Koyukuk, Nowitna and Innoko National Wildlife Refuges. 37 38 39 MR. HARRIS: Frank Harris, fish biologist, Office of Subsistence Management. 40 41 42 MR. BOSCH: Good morning. I'm Brandon I'm a Federal Wildlife Officer for Fish and 43 Bosch. Wildlife and also part time with the Park Service. 44 45

48 49 50

46 47

Fairbanks.

Manager, Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge, based in

MR. SPINDLER: Mike Spindler, Refuge

MR. MOOS: Kenton Moos. I'm the Refuge Manager for Koyukuk, Nowitna and Innoko Refuges out of Galena.

MR. STOUT: Glenn Stout, the Galena area biologist for Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MS. LONGSON: Sara Longson, the assistant Galena area biologist for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. Welcome to the meeting. We have a lot of agenda items and a fairly full agenda. So review and adoption of the agenda. Zach passed out the modified agenda. Does anybody have any insertions into the agenda.

(No comments)

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I wanted to see -there's some statewide proposals. I would like to add
section 11(b) after our wildlife proposals -- oh,
statewide proposals here. That's already here. So I'd
like to see -- there's several different statewide
proposals that would affect our region and we should
comment on a few of those.

I would like to see a more thorough update on the BLM RMP for Central Yukon and I want BLM to have more of a broader -- that was a big issue in our last meeting and I would like to see an update on the Ambler Road Project because we're real gray on what's actually going on with that. So those are items that I would like to see further expanded or included in the agenda.

Any other additions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Everybody's good with the agenda.

MR. VENT: I'm good with it. I'd like to comment on some of these proposals here too.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That's on the agenda. So the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as modified.

Page 8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say your name again. 2 I missed that one. 3 MS. STICKMAN: Danielle Stickman with 4 5 YRDFA. 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any others. 8 9 MR. PERRY: Mr. Chair. This is Phillip Perry. I'm the Management Coordinator for Region 5 for 10 the Western Arctic with Wildlife Conservation for Fish 11 and Game. 12 13 14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. 15 16 Any others. 17 MR. SHARP: Good morning, Jack. This 18 is Dan Sharp with Bureau of Land Management in 19 20 Anchorage. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Dan, welcome. 23 24 MR. JOLY: Hello, Mr. Chairman. 25 is Kyle Joly with the National Park Service. 26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 27 Kyle. 2.8 29 MR. MCKEE: Chris McKee, Wildlife 30 Division Chief, OSM. 31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Morning, Chris. 32 Did 33 we have somebody else join? 34 MR. AYERS: Good morning. 35 36 Scott Ayers, Fisheries, OSM. 37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning, Scott. 38 39 MS. LAVINE: Good morning. This is 40 Robbin LaVine with the Office of Subsistence 41 42 Management. 43 44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning, 45 Robbin. 46 47 MR. ESTENSEN: Good morning, Mr. Chair. This is Jeff Estensen with the Alaska Department of 48 Fish and Game, Fall Season Manager here in Fairbanks. 49 50

Page 9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning, Jeff. 1 2 3 4 MS. KLOSTERMAN: Good morning, Chair. 5 This is Megan Klosterman with the Office of Subsistence 6 Management. 7 8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Morning, Megan. Any 9 others. 10 11 (No comments) 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And I got a reminder to push \*6 to mute your phone in case there's 14 background noise. So welcome to the meeting those on 15 the phone. So we're viewing our minutes. Any 16 17 corrections or additional information that should be put into the minutes. 18 19 2.0 MS. CARROLL: Mr. Chair. This is Holly Carroll, Summer Season Manager for the Yukon. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Holly. 23 24 25 MS. CARROLL: I don't have the adapted new agenda in front of me, but I just wanted to offer 26 under the FRMP discussion of projects, former 11(b), I 27 would like to offer the ability to at least answer any 2.8 questions that the Council may have regarding any of 29 30 those projects and how we use them for management of chinook and summer chum. 31 32 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll enjoy your 34 input into those. Thanks, Holly. 35 36 MS. CARROLL: Thank you very much. 37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The only correction 38 I see for the minutes we had under the BLM presentation 39 on Page 13 lapping to 14 Tim LaMarr had a lengthy 40 discussion that should be reflected in the minutes with 41 42 this Council. 43 Any other additions to the minutes. 44 45 46 (No comments) 47 48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the minutes from last 49 50

Page 10 spring's meeting. 1 2 3 MS. PELKOLA: So moved. 4 5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny. 6 7 MR. SIMON: Second. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock. Those in favor of adoption of the agenda as modified 10 signify by saying aye. 11 12 13 IN UNISON: Aye. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign. 16 17 (No opposing votes) 18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council Member 19 2.0 reports. We usually go around the room and people give their reports for their area for the Council Members 21 and those in attendance. So, Jenny, you've got a nice 22 report for us on fishing. 23 24 25 MS. PELKOLA: I'm Jenny Pelkola and I'm living in Galena at the time. I'm originally from 26 Koyukuk. Well, fishing was pretty good last summer. I 27 think everyone got to fish and they were satisfied. 2.8 seems like there were more fish this year than I've 29 30 seen in the past, but I'm satisfied with what I got and I've heard a lot of people say that they were happy 31 with what they got also. The weather cooperated pretty 32 33 well. We had a few rain spots here and there, but 34 other than that it was pretty good. 35 36 Moose season went well I think. We didn't get our moose this year, but we got some meat 37 from a few people, so we're thankful for that. 38 39 40 I've been pretty busy with other 41 boards, traveling. 42 43 So I think that's all I would say right 44 now. 45 46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okav. Thanks, 47 Jenny. 48 Fred. 49 50

MR. ALEXIE: Good morning. My name is Fred W. Alexie, Sr. from Kaltag. I'd like to report that the king salmon season was very, very good this year. We got the big kings. When I say big kings, it's the 40-pound or better and that was the big average. There was some smaller, but the average was about 40 pounds. What that result in is we didn't have to get as many fish that we normally get. Like my family, we normally get 100 to 150, but I've got three families I've got to feed out of that 150. This year I only got 80 and that was plenty for all my families.

It was really good this year. This year we had a commercial summer chum run which went really good. Really good. A lot of drift, high water, but a lot of those fishermen on the Yukon they make booms to get the drift away from -- the drift running into the wheel, so they did that and it alleviated a lot of their problems.

What made it good our local people down there depend on firefighting season only and that commercial fishing in Kaltag. The fishermen from Galena all the way down to Kaltag they hire a bunch of local people, local kids. In the fish processing plant they hire a whole bunch of kids from all the villages between Galena and Kaltag. So that's an added income for everybody down there.

Our moose season went well. I know there's some proposals in our things there about putting the season on later in September. I know of one village that submitted one. I don't know if it's still there. It was there. At any rate, the big moose never came off the mountains until just a few days ago. Oh, my gosh, there's some big moose on that river. Big, 60-inch or better.

 My grandson shot his first moose, 73.5-inch, so I was very, very proud of him. We're going to have a big dinner once I go home. Anyway, that wasn't the only one, but there was a lot of 60-inchers coming off the mountains. But that was toward the end of the regular hunting season.

For our people's sake down there, that's why I want to see more proposals about that game change date so it's colder when we go out and the blue flies, the bugs don't get at the meat and the warm

weather and the rain. Rain hit that moose, that meat it spoils within a day or so, so we want to try to move that hunting season later.

We're all experiencing climate change. We've got to start dealing with that. Let's keep our proposals in line with that, the climate change.

At any rate, that's the extent of my report I'd like to make.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Fred.

Pollock.

2.0

2.4

2.8

 MR. SIMON: Pollock Simon from Allakaket. Our fishing was good. There was a lot of chum salmon, but didn't get much king salmon. When king salmon was coming up the river, there was a lot of rain. We had to pull the net because of a lot of debris. We don't use fishwheel, we just use setnet and it makes it kind of difficult for us when water raises a lot of debris in the river and we have to pull the net out or keep cleaning it.

There was a lot of chum salmon. I have a 60-foot net and I have to release over half of it because the net gets too much, over 100 salmon a day. That's too much. People that have dogs are the ones that fish for chum salmon pretty much. Since there was a restriction on the salmon, king salmon, people don't go to fish camp that much because the king salmon being the main fish diet for our people. If they can't get it, then they don't fish at all. Some of them don't have a fish net.

Some years back we had a king net, 8-inch and 7.5. Then the regulations changed to outlaw that size and we went down to 6-inch, which we didn't have. So the Fish and Game told us to surrender that bigger net. Tanana Chiefs sent us 6-inch net, but there's more restrictions. Once that king salmon is passing, you pull the 6-inch and set 4-inch.

Well, I have all kinds of sizes of nets because I have to feed a dozen dogs, so I have 4-inch to set, but not everybody. Some of my neighbors don't

have -- they pull the 6-inch, they don't have no 4-inch to set, so that was some kind of hardship for them, the people that don't have net. When we have a regulation change, we have to use a different net.

There wasn't that much moose moving, so maybe people didn't -- some people didn't get their moose, but like all the small communities somebody get moose, your relatives, they share with you and give you meat. Like Fred and Jenny said, there's global warming in effect and moose is staying up in the hedge until it start getting cold and they come down to the river.

2.0

When I left Allakaket yesterday, there was the first sprinkle of snow, but it didn't stay and I see it's still raining. I would support a later season to go with the global warming like in rural areas like Allakaket. There's no supermarket store. We have to get our moose, go out and get our meat. If the moose is not there, then it's kind of difficult for a family. A long, cold winter ahead when won't get the moose.

Around Allakaket area is 24B we didn't get a caribou coming through for 10 years, so there's a shortage of meat. But everybody shares their moose meat with their family members.

Another thing to talk about, I know Fred talked about this, is firefighting being the only source of income for our young people in the village. In state of Alaska there wasn't that many fires this year because too wet, so that's kind of hard on the young people. That's where they make their money, firefighting, but luckily there was a lot of fires Outside, the Lower 48. So the crew from Allakaket did go Outside and made a little bit of money. One trip, two-week stints.

It's kind of wet. I see it still raining out there, but I'm glad to be here.

That's all.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: Good morning, Chair. I had a few things that I wanted to let people know what's going on in our area. We have the same problem with firefighting. I guess a lot of the uses for firefighting is depending on State to send out their resources and also getting the Lower 48 resources when we have people available that did this their whole life.

We were considered -- you know, back in the '80s we were considered a Type 1 crew and then they started saying, well, you need all these trainings. When we were fighting those fires, we were fighting right at the fire front. It wasn't, you know, just standing there watching it go by like we have to do now. No, we were there just fighting right alongside the firefighters, but now it's different. They're saying you have to go through all these trainings when we already knew what the fires were about. Then they said, no, you have to follow our regulations.

So that's some of the problems that we're having issues with. I know that was brought up in one of our subregional meetings. We're having issues with all our people that's qualified for all these jobs and it's kind of hurting us in the villages. We have people who are qualified, but they have to have a certain amount of paperwork in order to do it.

The thing with all this I think is that we've got to start considering trying to help our people in the villages because now we're getting back fishing, but some of our people lost that traditional knowledge of how to fish. It's taking some of the elders to train them, but now we're losing all of our elders, so it's harder for our younger ones to adapt to how our people lived all these years.

 They're starting to live more on the school and it's providing more suicide rates. I mean people are starting to think there's nowhere else for them to go. Firefighting was rough this year, so I know a lot of them are kind of in that depression zone right now. It's just some things that we have to consider how are we going to be surviving out there in the villages. It's 80 percent or better unemployment. I noticed people were talking about it, so I just had to bring that up.

On our moose we did good this year. We didn't have a lot of hunters because most of them were coming up and they had a better season down in the Lower Koyukuk area and the Yukon area. There was more moose down there, so they didn't have to come up quite a ways to do their hunting. Just the regular people that like to go camping and hunting. They like some areas around there, so they come back every year, so we have those people that come up and go hunting.

It wasn't overpopulated this time. In the years before we see a lot of boats going by and when they go by we have a hard time catching our moose. I spent probably 1,400 just trying to catch moose last year and I didn't catch a moose. This year I spent 3-400. I'm happy, I got a moose, so I got something to eat this year.

Talking about climate change. We're worried because our moose meat when we're drying it it's not drying. Not like it does when it's a little cooler and the right kind of drying temperature so our meat doesn't quite -- dried meat doesn't quite taste the same. It takes a little longer, starts turning white. I noticed people are talking about that. They say maybe it's because the weather is not right.

So I want to talk about climate change. You know, that's some things that are affecting us in the villages and the meat is starting to spoil faster so we're losing meat. We have to put that meat away right away. Takes two days to put it away and I see some people still traveling the river four days and that meat is pretty much done on the outside. I don't know what it looks like on the inside.

The weather is not cooperating no more. It's something that we're going to have to probably consider. I think there's a lot of issues there. There's a lot of people that want to consider the weather. That's something I think we're going to have to eventually look into later on down the years.

This year we had more bears in the village than previous. We had one black and five other bears. We had to get rid of four of them so far and there's still two more out there hanging around there by the dump and just -- they come in the nighttime and they come right to the edge of the villages, so our

kids can't go out. We have to really be careful. There's more bears than usual. There's something going on there. I don't know what it is, but they're starting to hang around our village. We didn't really see a lot of that maybe five, ten years ago, but now from then on we started seeing more and more activity.

There's something going on that's making the bears starting to move in toward the villages. Hopefully something can be looked into and see what's causing them to come around our area. We never had to deal with them before. I remember when I was a little kid that we used to go out. All we brought was a .22 or a shotgun. Now we have to carry a rifle as soon as we step out the door. It's a whole lot different story. So something is going on there. The bears are starting to move. So just putting that out there.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a bad berry year down there?

MR. VENT: No, people were catching

26 them.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I mean the berries.

 MR. VENT: Oh, the berries. It was more closer to the village, so maybe that might have been one of the reasons why they were coming. Plus all the bones and stuff that people throw away, like the moose heads and stuff after they cut everything off there. They put them down there next to -- they've got an area where they keep everything there and that's why the bears are coming around there maybe too.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. The berry crop where I live was real poor.

Ray.

MR. COLLINS: Speaking of berries, yeah, it was a poor year, but fortunately we had a really abundant year the year before, so we put up over 30 gallons in the freezer. So that will carry us through this winter even though we didn't get as many. But the cranberries were good. So that was all right.

In terms of the salmon, especially the kings, we've had early closures downriver so they don't open it up for kings down there and it's really made a difference in the headwaters. We've got a weir now in the Salmon River, which is one of the more productive streams in the headwaters. Before at the best they estimated about 2,000 a year escapement. It jumped up to 6,400 and 6,800.

I don't have the figure this year, but it was something comparable to that. So about three years we've had a real jump, almost three times the escapement, that we were getting before. So if we can continue that for a couple more years when we get those four and five-year-olds coming back from those spawning we should see even more gains up there.

But it caused a price down in the Bethel area because they like that early drying weather down there, so they've had to hold off before and they were more limited in kings down there. The actual numbers coming into the river were lower. So the jump we're getting is off of poor years in terms of runs even by giving them protection as they come up the river. So that's a positive thing.

2.8

And they did open it up up in the McGrath area there. We were able to take kings there. But those heading further upstream actually go right by McGrath. We can't drift up there because of the snags, so we have to use setnet only. So they got some kings at McGrath, but not a lot still because those ones, as I mentioned, they go right by up the middle of the river. Down below they were catching by drifting and so they opened that early. They'll knock that population down again. So we're hoping we can keep that closure early on.

In terms of moose, the State's efforts out there to reduce bears they had to -- as you know, for about five years we closed the area about 20 miles around McGrath and made an experimental moose management area. They had different terms for it. And you had to get a permit before season before you could hunt in the rest of the area around there. Well, we've opened it up now. It's been open for about three years now. The population of young cows has really increased with the reduction in the mortality on the young ones. We weren't getting calf survival. So that was a

positive effort on the State. Most of the harvest in younger bulls.

Like as mentioned in other places, some of the bigger bulls don't come in until later down to the river. They're back in the hills. But we do have it open through the 25th there now, so that helps some later in the season. I personally didn't get a moose this year. I missed two opportunities, but we were given half a moose. Everybody that needed meat got it in McGrath pretty well.

Same is true I think up in Nikolai above. They did okay also. So there's been a turnaround in the moose numbers. We've got a good breeding population out there. But the bears are starting to increase right along with it. So far they can -- we're still getting enough survival of calves to keep the population growing for a little while.

I guess that's about all I have to report that's pertinent.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray.

Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Chairman Reakoff. Timothy Gervais. Yeah, the salmon harvest in the Ruby region was really good. Seemed like everybody had their needs met. It was good on abundance and good on quality. Actually there was so much fish that some people expressed some concern that it wasn't all being -- everything that was being caught wasn't being processed as good as it could be because of just too much abundance.

 We also had a summer visit by ADF&G Commissioner Cotten came down to discuss salmon management with the village and that was really good outreach on the Department of Fish and Game's part. So we appreciate that.

King salmon abundance wasn't great all over the state. There was not that strong of a run in the Kuskokwim. The Nushagak, which is Bristol Bay's main king salmon river, was extremely weak on king

salmon. I believe it was late July or early August Department of Fish and Game actually had a closure on all king salmon retention on Southeast Alaska.

As this Council has been focused on the salmon issue for several decades now, we're seeing that it's really -- even with all the experience of the managers and experience of the users it's still -- fisheries management, game management, it's just something that's not all -- can't be said this is happening because of this and that, because of that.

So I feel like as we go forward in our policy recommendations and stuff like that remember -- you hear terms best available science and management according to science, but with the fish it's really hard to understand how the complexities of the river and the ocean systems. So I think it's good to err on the side of conversation and allow the resource to be able to reproduce and keep the resource sustainable.

Also an interesting development I'm seeing down in Ruby is there's more fishermen switching over to drift gillnet gear, which is something I've been pretty slow for quite a while. As people are learning, they're getting less bycatch of pike and whitefish by doing drift fishing. So you're seeing a shift in harvest technique.

I think that plays into where we see these new gear types being allowed on the lower river for salmon and some of the managers saying, well, there's not that many fishermen doing and stuff like that. You see now where the resource -- or when a harvest technique is effective or efficient on time or fuel that the fishermen will adopt into it and have to be careful not to allow too much harvesting power so that affects the manager's ability to control the harvest.

Gulf of Alaska bottom trawlers are starting to complain pretty loudly about having to work around king salmon catch throughout the year. They're saying it's impacting their ability to meet their market. So we'll have to just keep track of that discussion and realizing that there's these issues that mostly take place in North Pacific Management Council venue. For king salmon caps they do have economic impact to the industrial fishing sector. We have to

realize that when it affects their business revenue, then they're going to push back and lobby hard to get the restrictions changed or modified.

This summer I heard a radio story that the National Park Service had won a court case or an appeal regarding a fellow that was operating a jet boat on the Nation River in Yukon-Charley Preserve and the court had ruled in favor of the National Park Service. That's a case that's dealing with -- I guess it would be jurisdiction on who can regulate stuff, so that doesn't really affect us exactly, but that sets a court precedence for National Park Service being able to have their rulemaking effect the way the hunter was operating.

2.0

The Ruby Tribe is submitting a grant, Tom Seton, to bring another 12 or 15 wood bison into the Ruby region. That's in the pretty early stages, but there's some work being done to try and bring in more bison from the Wildlife Rehabilitation Center there at Portage/Girdwood.

 I'd like Council Member Honea to talk about some work he's doing with bringing some reindeer into the Ruby area also during this report.

On moose, even though it was warm, wet weather, there was a lot of harvest. Potentially record harvest for our community. So there's no shortage of moose anywhere in the community. Some community members are concerned with overharvest. Two or three moose per household type situation. People had talked about trying to limit the number of moose per household, but it's a pretty hard thing to manage. I think it's better managed by just good communication and good sharing and cooperation in the community.

We had a little bit of wanton waste issue with some sport harvested meat coming out of Melozi. The meat was donated to some people in Ruby and it went bad a day after they had received it and it ended up in a Ruby dump.

I'd like to personally thank Alaska
Department of Fish and Game and the Nowitna Refuge for
doing a really great job on the moose management in our
area. It's real significant for the community to be
able to have great harvest opportunity and success like

they did this year. So I appreciate all your hard work and good results.

It's kind of an interesting situation. Like normally if you had a late season moose this year, you could have some quarters hang and butcher them in the winter, later spring, whenever you needed the meat, but with this warm, overcast weather nothing kept that well and everybody had to either can or freeze all their meat. There's not -- the weather is too warm to have anything hanging.

And then starting to be some concern from some community members that subsistence hunters are targeting large moose not specifically late season, but some of them came in late season, which wouldn't be traditional harvest of big moose late season due to quality of meat. The allowable sale of antlers it seems that some members of the community are starting to target big moose for the benefit of being able to sell those antlers when the antler buyer comes down the river.

2.8

So that's been a cause of concern that's kind of more highlighted this year with so many moose. We just have to keep an eye on it as a community and make sure subsistence stays about meat and food harvest and not about selling antlers.

 $$\operatorname{I'd}$  like to thank everybody for attending our meeting.

It's good to see everyone.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Tim.

Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: Dennis Thomas, Crooked Creek. Our king salmon this year was pretty good. Everybody that wanted some got some. For ourselves there's four families that we work together. Our family and then I've got two sons and a daughter that all have families, so we all work together, but we got our dry fish up. We also were able to freeze a few kings, which we haven't been able to much in the past. We've got to use it up. So that was pretty good.

And then the reds were exceptionally good this year compared to what we've had in the past. I know we'd like to eat those fresh because they're good and also to bake the mamothluks (ph), whatever the hell they call them. I can't even pronounce the word, but they're really great out of the reds.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12 13

1 2

3 4

5

The chum salmon as usual for our area was pretty good. A lot of times we get more than we want. You're out there and start doing your fish and all of a sudden you've got a big pile of those in, but it works out. We made a lot of strips out of them this year and stuff. So it gets kind of dry and that, but it's good. The taste of them are good.

14 15 16

17

18 19

20

21

As far as getting people to catch them, like I say, I've got a wife and I got a daughter and I've got three or four granddaughters running around there to cut them up. We have a lot of young men that want to go out and drift. They don't want to cut them, but they don't mind going out and drift the fish. that works out well for us.

22 23 24

25

26

27

But the whole village did well on it The silvers have always been good, but we don't drift for those so much. We got out with a stick to get them. A stick fish, whatever you want to call it, you know, and that works well.

2.8 29 30

31 32

33

34

35

36

The moose were good this year. Everybody in the village that wanted some got some. With the Federal thing going and you've got to get permission and all this, it works well for us. hunt anymore. I can't even hardly walk up the bank. But I've got two sons. I've got one older. He just loves to go out and whack 'em and he always gets 'em. He's really a good hunter. He was a guide for a while.

37 38 39

40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

But we haven't gotten any caribou for years and I hope that that caribou herd starts -- keeps growing and eventually their path back up through us. Years ago I could shoot them off my front porch if I wanted, you know. One year there was two bunches of them wanting to cross the river there with the ice running. A pack of wolves up here and a pack of wolves down here and they'd run up there and they'd run down there. Finally they crossed during the night when the ice was running in the river because of such a pressure from wolves on them, you know.

But that doesn't seem to be so heavy. We do have them around, but they sure aren't as noticeable. For a while they were coming to the village and killing the dogs and all that.

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 2

3

Now upriver out of Sleetmute for a couple years, I think it was two or three years ago, the Fish and Game was up there shooting bears out of helicopters. They got 70-80 bear a year up there for the two years that I remember. A few of them were brown bears too. But I don't know whether that's helped the moose or what it is. Whatever it is it's working. Our moose is coming back. It's a doable thing. So it isn't such a hit and miss.

14 15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Not only that years ago -- not that many years ago all the people from downriver come up to our area to go hunting. Anywhere from all the way up to McGrath and beyond that. At the store there I used to have 50-60 boats a day coming through there buying gas and stuff from me. It was really really a busy season. Now two or three a day maybe. A lot of that is it was a dollar or two a gallon of gas, it's seven, eight, nine dollars a gallon for gas. I think that kills a hell of a lot of it. Nonetheless we're doing pretty good in our area.

26 27 2.8

> 29 30

31

32 33

34

35

Firefighting. We haven't had firefighting coming to our village for 40 years or better. So if you get any at all you're damn lucky. Now we had some firefighters in the village this year, but they were from Kenai and they were from the Yukon and whatever. They get teams of these people get together and most of the Native people, locals and they're good kids. They're working like everybody else.

40 41

42

So I had a couple guys hired out of the village to get water and do this kind of thing, but as far as the economy of Crooked Creek it doesn't do anything. It doesn't do any good for the stores either if they come in or not because these guys bring everything in.

43 44 45

46

47 48

Now years ago we had two years in a row we had fires up there right by the village. We had six crews there at one time parked all over the place. They bought everything through the store. Those were the best years I ever had. They were renting boats,

they were renting this, they were renting that, they were renting this building. One group would rent the front of the building and the other group would rent the rear of the building. I mean it was really great. Hell, I could take that every year. The money was good, you know.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

1 2

3

4 5

> Again, it didn't help the local people work because they weren't getting any of the local teams in there. When we first got there 45 years ago they did take crews out of there every year and then all of a sudden, boom, they stopped it. We haven't had a crew there in 43-44 years. That's not a viable thing for us.

14 15 16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

26

As far as commercial fishing, we're never had it upriver.

Kalskag had some and on down. I don't know what they're doing there now. With the king salmon commercial fishing down there getting chopped down, boy it's really -- that just as much as anything has made a big difference with us. And it's really good. You go Instead of getting a couple, three kings out there. for the whole summer, you're getting a couple of drifts sometimes. Like I said, last year we were able to freeze some of these things. They're quite abundant, you know.

27 2.8 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

I hope it doesn't change whatever they're doing down there. The thing people got to remember -- you go back east, like you go back to Pennsylvania, we were up to Harrisburg there for a few years doing a sports show. That town is shut down. You've got a mile of these big steel mills shut down. The industry changes. Now maybe some of this commercial fishing maybe it isn't what it used to be. Maybe these people are going to have to start looking for something different also. Things change.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44 45

46

How many people are leaving the Bush to go to Anchorage. No income back there. They go to town, some of them could get a job. I would hope that they come back. Right now -- years ago when I was on the school board, we had over 500 kids in the school district. When I left the school district, we had 340. That's 40 percent loss. People moving to town, you know.

47 48

So what's the answer back there.

like living there. I love it. I don't want to live anywhere else. I've got my dish, I can watch my football, my baseball and all this. I don't care about anything else really. I get my fish, my son gets my moose. Hell, I live pretty nice, you know.

5 6 7

8 9

1 2

3 4

> The whole world is changing. changing. And this is the kind of thing I guess we're trying to do here, to keep up with the times and try to make it where it's a viable place to live. Sometimes you've got to do a little push. Sometimes you get irritated.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

10

11

I remember my wife was on the Kuskokwim fishing thing down there. Boy, she'd be on the phone for hours here and there. Oh, we're not going to do We're not going to have any commercial openings down here. They hang up the phone. An hour later, oh, yeah, they're going to have a commercial opening down there and irritate everybody that spent hours listening to this crap and trying to do something about it, you know.

22 23 24

25

26

Okay, who opens it up. Is this the State, the Feds, whoever it is. This is where we're getting to them. It's working, Jack. It's working. We are making some progress.

27 2.8 29

30

31

32

Just like that road to Ambler. to hell it doesn't go because you're going to ruin an awful lot of country up there. Maybe I'm a treehugger, whatever you want to call it. I don't know. All I know is I see what it does for the area, you know.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40 41

Now we've got that mine going in up above Crooked, 8-10 miles up the creek. So far it hasn't had an impact on the village. It hasn't affected our water supply coming down the creek or anything like this. They've been up there, what, 15-20 years now dinking around and they're still up there. Right now they're doing a little work. They eventually may make that a big mine. Maybe they'll spoil the creek a little bit. I don't know.

43 44 45

46

47

48

42

All I know is as of right now they're doing everything that's possible to avoid that. Now at one time we had 23 people in the village of Crooked Creek working up there and that's out of 100 and some people. That's pretty good. That helps a lot.

what do we got. I think they got a couple three out of the village up there now doing something.

A lot of that isn't the Donlin Gold outfit. They subbed this out. Okay, we need a contract. You tell us what you're going to do. So they're hiring their own crews, rather than when Donlin was there they were hiring local people. This was really, really work. The head people with the mine were at our place at Crooked there, the lodge. This is where the guys that run it, the president, the vice president, the big wheels.

They wonder how come this works here in this place and this is the only place in the world that we work this well with the local people. They give them jobs, they give them opportunities, they give them the responsibility and you got it. They made management out of these people and all this kind of thing.

2.8

Again, these people that live in the Bush they know how to get things done. It's what you've had to do your whole life, you know. I just hope good things come of it. I don't know what the hell is going to happen to Pebble. I don't know yet. Everybody says it's bad, then other people say it's good. Goodness, I don't know. That would be a big operation. That would employ a lot of people.

But look at the Red Dog. They got that whole road to haul it to the beach. They see all the things dying around that from all the dust kicking up. I don't know. But I know the State sometimes they're not too honest with the people there and they don't really care about what's happening in the Bush sometimes.

So I hope that what little we can do here, if anything at all, is going to be good for the people. I hope we make the right decisions here and that we could get to the people to do something. If we try it, what the hell is wrong. Try it. If it don't work, it doesn't work. Okay. We could always rescind it and do something else, you know. But you've got to be out there and have the guts to do it. That's all I can say, you know.

Just like old Murkowski when he was in

there, he cut off the senior money. I sure didn't like that, you know. Whether it's right or not, I don't know, but it sure would be nice to get an extra \$250 a month now that I'm a senior.

5 6

1 2

3

4

Anyway, I gabbed here too much.

7 8

Enough.

9 10

Thank you.

11 12

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Dennis.

13 14

Don.

15 16

17

18

19 2.0

21

22

23

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Don Honea, Jr. of Ruby. Maybe I'm just going to kind of echo what Tim and Jenny -- fishing on the Yukon, like Fred said, was excellent this year. We, as a family, two of us we only caught 30 fish, 30 kings, but that was sufficient. That was sufficient. You know, we were just really happy with that. You know, I don't go into a hundred numbers, those kind of numbers and stuff.

24 25 26

27

2.8

29 30

31

My train of thought is if the king salmon wasn't good, you always got a million chums or something coming up the river later and we utilize those. You have to use what's there. I often found that, hey, summer chums, God, they were so rich, they were so oily. They were almost as oily as the kings. So, hey, we just learn to use what we have.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

I was really confused. I thought this was a fishing year and I think maybe OSM could help me or give us kind of a chronological thing here where we are. We're looking at some of the proposals, the hunting and fishing, that were submitted in March. Chair, tell me. You know, it's really kind of confusing.

40 41 42

43

44 45

46

47 48

We had a tribal meeting a couple days ago and someone on the council asked me what year we are. I thought we were in a fishing cycle year and Jack says it's two years or something. I could never understand that. So I quess the village next to me, Louden, put in a fishing proposal and I think probably that's coming up in February, January. I don't know exactly the timeline. I wish we could have a timeline

kind of a thing to look at so we can plan accordingly and submit our proposals accordingly.

These guys over from the Kusko, Ray and Dennis here, we need input from every one of our region. Our region is so vast. We have proposals on here about caribou. We have some crossover proposals. I don't know a thing about it. I'm relying on them. That's where the expertise of Carl Morgan and those guys come in. So I think that in the future we should somehow get the word out there that each region is represented equally because I'm not going to be able to vote on something that I don't know about. I don't know the numbers. I don't know what the Mulchatna Caribou Herd is doing.

Other than that, Tim brings up interesting points. And Ruby is really unique. When we talk about taking some of the breeding bulls there off of the road, we're not talking about Federal lands. That's an RM-38. That's a State registration hunt. When people are taking 60-inch bulls out there, two per family, there's something wrong and not sharing. So I think we discussed that as a tribe, but we thought Ruby AC would be better able to do that. We as a tribe do not want to mix politics in our hunting and fishing and I think it wise. So anyway that's going to come up.

Also Tim mentioned and he probably wanted me to expound on the reindeer and the bison. We, as a tribe, are trying to be proactive and bringing in -- whether it's bison, bison would be great, or reindeer. Incidently, we're going to meet with I think mid-November Ruby and Stevens Village right here in Fairbanks to speak on that. Either one of them I just think it's great that we have a viable food source that's sustainable, that we could put out there. I think the future looks good for that.

If your tribe has a chance to do that, by all means. I mean I'm just excited for the GASH area. If that area succeeds, if that bison popular down there because it's a healthy, really good meat.

Other than that it's good to be here. I've missed a couple meetings. When we meet again, I realize this is at the end of our meeting, I'd like to see us be able to meet in Galena. We can fix the phone business, stuff like that. I just think it's nice to

be able to come in here.

1 2 3

 I also had kind of an idea and I spoke to Carl this morning about it from OSM. I think that maybe sometimes we could sit down and discuss some of the options of getting us to meetings, whether it's what to charter like in the past or weighing the options. I mean is it cost effective to bring us to --say if we had a meeting in McGrath, is it cost effective to bring us into Fairbanks, bring us into Anchorage, overnight there, and then over there.

The old way where we had a charter and we just went around a circuit and picked up people. Maybe that's a point of discussion or maybe not. Anyway, I just wanted to see if we could weigh the options there and if we as Council Members had any input into that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don.

MS. PELKOLA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Jenny.

MS. PELKOLA: Sorry, but when I gave my report I'm just a little bit under the weather today. I'd just like to for the record the subregions in our area were very disappointed that the meeting was not held in Galena and that would be the village of Kaltag, Nulato, Koyukuk, Huslia, Ruby and Galena.

TCC offered their equipment, whatever we needed for our meetings. I was supposed to look into that, but I was unable to because I had a death in the family and I had to leave Galena. But just for future meetings just to let you know that the people were very disappointed because there was going to be representatives from the other villages coming in with concerns.

Also I'd like to say that last week on Friday the First Chiefs met with BLM regarding employment and hiring practices in our area. TCC was there and all the First Chiefs from the subregion were there. We had a long discussion on that, so hopefully a lot of the issues will be worked out somehow.

I think that's about all I have to say, but right now I'm just not feeling very well and I'm going to try to make it today.

Go ahead, Zach.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,

6 Jenny.

enny.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. By way of context, in mid June of this summer, a call was put in to the Native Village of Louden just to address the issue of the possibility of having the meeting there. It came to the attention of the Office of Subsistence Management that the Council did not have access to an analog landline, which is required for us to transcribe and record the meeting. At which point we were required to make a decision as to where to hold the meeting.

2.4

At that point there was a fisheries issue going on in region that brought the attention of the State of Alaska and the Governor's Office and it came to our attention that that was occupying the attention of the council of Louden so they were focusing on that fisheries issue.

After that point, having to secure a location for the meeting, particularly one that could accommodate the analog landline, the decision was made that we would hold the meeting here in Fairbanks. After Fairbanks was selected later in the summer, it came to our attention that Galena could accommodate the line, but at that point we'd already secured this venue.

Consequently, three additional calls were made to the Council because it became evident that the Council was concerned that individuals were welcome at this meeting and wanting to share input. While those calls were not returned, messages were left with the Council to inform them that the Louden Council and for that matter all members of the public were welcome and invited to attend this meeting.

It's certainly our intent to get back out to Galena in the future, which we expressed our desire to get back out there, assuming we can resolve those technology issues. Again, it's our hope that

this forum and its public format, both here and in Fairbanks and via our teleconference, provides an opportunity for all members of the public who have comments to share to be able to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Zach.

Darrel.

 MR. VENT: Sorry, I forgot to mention, you know, that our area depends mostly on summer chum and silver. We're looking into seeing that -- they're starting to have commercial on it that kind of makes us worried about what happened with the king salmon once you start putting commercial on there. Hopefully they learn from previous years that they got to take care of this fish. Otherwise there's not going to be no money involved and it's going to take the money out of it again.

So just to let them be aware that we depend on this fish, the summer chum and the silvers. We don't hardly use the king salmon. So that's our point of view there.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Darrel. My question for Don and Tim is really high harvest in Ruby. Was that mostly on the road or was that mostly just moose in general. Don.

MR. HONEA: Yeah, I could answer that. I guess when I say it's unique because we've got 40 miles of road going one way and that thing is heavily trafficked during hunting season and that's where you're going to find -- you know, mostly you take a typical village. They don't have roads. Everybody down there has a truck of some sort. A lot of vehicles for such a little place and everybody is on that road and therein kind of lies the problem. It's unique.

I mean like I said you don't in any other village see a lot of women out on the road hunting or I mean hunting period because of the road system. So it creates that kind of a -- and it's a State hunt I'm talking about, so I think that we're going to have to submit as the Ruby AC some kind of measures. You know, I hate to open a can of worms and

say, you know, one per household, but that's where it may go.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Well, moose were high this year and that road is high, so that's probably why the harvest was up. Some years they might drop to lower elevations. I was going to give my report.

When we met last spring here in Fairbanks the Board of Game was in session and at that time I had big concerns for the Central Arctic Caribou Herd. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee was urging restrictions on cow caribou harvest, in particular myself.

2.8

The Board closed cow caribou hunting in 26B Southeast, which helped a whole bunch. Last year they killed 200 and some cow caribou. This year there was supposed to be zero cow caribou harvested in that lower part. That's where the road hunters are hunting.

There were several caribou that were seized by enforcement. Guys were shooting cow caribou. They didn't know a cow caribou from a bull caribou. They didn't pay attention to the reg book that explains specifically how to tell the differences. But not nearly as many cow caribou were killed. That herd fell from 68,000 down to 22,600.

I got an email from Beth Lenart, the area biologist. She says they did a digital photo census. They're seeing more caribou mainly because of the digital photography. Reproduction has been good the last two or three years. So we need to conserve cow caribou. The Board did that, so I was real happy that the Board of Game closed cow caribou hunting there.

 One of the calculations that was not made in the analysis on harvest is the wound loss rate with caribou. Caribou have a really high wound loss rate. They're an open terrain animal, they're a herding animal. People shooting at long range into herds bad things happen. So there's no real calculation, no enumeration of that wound loss rate.

 $\,$  I had a biologist at the Department tell me that they felt there could be easily a 30  $\,$ 

percent wound loss rate. When Tim. Osborn on the Koyukuk asked hunters how many moose they wounded at the check station in Ellis Cabin -- that was back in the '80s, wasn't it, Glenn? He found that 15 percent of the hunters had wounded moose. So that was what he told me.

When these caribou herds are at this low status, we need to have really good cow conservation and I'm real happy that the Board saw the light and started putting on some real conservation on those cow caribou in the North Slope. You're not going to get a herd to come back.

2.4

The perception is caribou run around in these big herds. There must be like millions of them and they must be highly productive. No, they're not actually real productive. They have less than half of the reproductive rate of a moose. If the moose population fell by two-thirds, you wouldn't have any cow moose harvest. But caribou are caribou, they're -just shoot them. It's like no. Caribou have one calf per year. They never have twins, ever. So they're really a sensitive animal to harvest, so we need to have caribou conservation.

2.8

The harvest was real high this year. The enforcement was fairly lacking on the Dalton Highway. We have a lot of draw permits on the Dalton Highway. I saw a lot of hunters hunting. I'm not enforcement, but I suspect that they were hunting — either there was a road crew up there that just showed up in the Upper Dietrich River. Those guys seemed to think that there was wide-open hunting season there.

I've got trail cams on roads outside the Dalton Highway Corridor. I've got pictures of State vehicles that are supposed to be watching the road. They're out driving all the roads. There was a lot of hunting activity.

With the reduction in budget for the State of Alaska, the Fish and Wildlife protection officer that we have there he's overwhelmed and the BLM officer, he's overwhelmed also. I can foresee that this next year we're going to have enforcement problems because there's the road crews. They show up in the country. They pretty much think it's a free-for-all system. They don't pay much attention to game

regulations unless somebody actually starts enforcing.

1 2 3

So our protection officer he's leaving, so we'll have a new State enforcement officer/trooper. So we're going to have some problems next year and we're going to need to have additional Federal presence on the Dalton Highway. So that's kind of heads up for Brandon back there in the back of the room.

I did see a lot of gut piles. There was quite a bit of harvest there. Moose were high. Moose stayed low. They came down low in the upper drainages through the end of the season. The oddity was I saw large bulls eating food with cows and they're still eating. They stayed real fat late into the season. That was kind of unusual.

The hare population is really high right now. The Brooks Range goes through an 18-year modulation and our hare population is really high. The wolves are basically ignoring large game animals and eating rabbits. Practically all the droppings are just full of rabbit bones and hair. But when the snow gets over 15 inches, then the wolves switch to big game. That's when it gets harder for them to catch those. So with wolf populations increasing with this hare population, that's going to eventually start to bite into our local sheep and moose population.

The sheep population is really low, but it's starting to turn around. We're starting to get better lamb production. So there's conservation. The main conservation was -- the Board of Game made it illegal to spot sheep with an aircraft. During the sheep season that highly affected the guide's ability to harvest sheep. They were basically killing all legal rams with the use of aircraft. Now they're afraid to use aircraft because that's a misdemeanor. So that was a very effective regulatory change that's helped the sheep.

 We had Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission met in Wiseman last April. That commission makes regulatory recommendations. So we had a conference call in August, so there will be comments on these Federal proposals from that SRC.

I do want the Council to be aware that Greq Roczicka died. He was on the Y-K Delta Council and

was very instrumental on conservation of salmon on the Kuskokwim River and that was a real loss to the program and to the people on the Kuskokwim River. I was concerned. He was such a huge advocate for conservation of chinook salmon and a conservation of salmon in general.

I would like a letter written from this Council of condolence to his family and to the Y-K Delta Council. They lost a huge member of their Council when they lost Greg. He was also on the Game Board. That's where I first met him was in 2002. He was on the Game Board at that time. He was a real smart person.

2.0

2.4

Then Raymond Stoney, he was also on the Western Interior Caribou Work Group, Northwest Arctic. He died recently also. I would like a letter written from this Council to his family and to that Regional Council because those Councils lost two real important members. I feel that in the Western Interior. I feel that because we have a joint management with the Kuskokwim and the Y-K Delta. I feel that on the Western Interior side and I would like a letter of condolence sent to those two Councils and their family members.

That would be my report.

So it's 10:26.

We should go for a potty break here and then we'll come back in 15 minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're back on the

record.

Go ahead, Ray.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. I make a motion that we authorize you to draft those letters of condolence to the two individuals mentioned.

MR. HONEA: Second.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The discussion was on Greg Roczicka and Raymond Stoney's Regional Councils, Y-K Delta and Northwest Arctic, and their family members.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have the motion and second. Any further discussion on those letters.

(No comments)

MR. SIMON: Question.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is called. Those in favor of submitting those signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're down on our agenda items here. Service awards. Go ahead, Carl.

2.8

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of Council. Good morning. MY name is Carl Johnson. I'm the Council Coordination Division Chief with the Office of Subsistence Management.

It's really quite an honor and a privilege to be here at the table for this particular reason and that is to recognize essentially a lifetime of service to the Western Interior Region by one of your members, Mr. Raymond Collins.

Ray Collins has been living off the land in the Upper Kuskokwim River region since he moved to Nikolai in 1963. He gained a deep understanding of fish and wildlife resources from learning from the elders in his area and spending season after season out on the land.

He has shared his incredible knowledge through a lifetime of service from serving over 40 years on the McGrath State Fish and Game Advisory Committee, 24 years on this Council, and also serving on the Denali National Park Subsistence Resource Commission and the Kuskokwim River Salmon Working

Group. 1 2 Through that service he has continued 3 to gain a deeper knowledge of the resources in the 4 5 Western Interior Region. He has shown to be a thoughtful, active and dedicated leader on fish and 6 7 wildlife issues. 8 9 And these are just some of the reasons why the Federal Subsistence Board and the Office of 10 Subsistence Management wanted to recognize and take a 11 moment to offer this recognition to Raymond Collins for 12 his many years of tremendous service to the people and 13 to the resources of the Western Interior Region. 14 15 I would like to have the Council and 16 17 everybody in this room join me in recognizing Raymond 18 Collins. 19 20 (Applause) 21 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Congratulations, Ray. You've got a couple words. 23 24 25 MR. COLLINS: I'm speechless. 26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I've been with 27 you on this Council since '93. Ray was our first 2.8 Chair. Ray's done a lot of work on this Council. 29 Pollock was there also. So really appreciate all your 30 31 input and work for us, Ray. 32 33 MR. COLLINS: Well, thank you. I would like to mention that I really appreciate the elders 34 that taught me the knowledge of the traditional ways 35 36 and the language of the Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskans there in Nikolai. It was that that led me to get 37 involved in these because of all they had invested in 38 me and time as I was studying the language there. 39 payback has kind of been to be able to work on these 40 groups and try to make the laws, both Federal and 41 42 State, to work for the people up there. 43 44 Thank you. 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. 46 47 48 Pollock.

MR. SIMON: Yes, I'd like to congratulate Ray for all his time on this board. Ray lived around McGrath area all his life and he's been active in fishing, wildlife and fish and game and also this board for many years. I'd like to thank him for his service. He has a good knowledge about the subsistence way of life around that area and he's been pretty active on this board and giving good advice to us.

10 11

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

Thank you, Ray.

12 13

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock. So we're moving down on the agenda. We're on public and tribal comments.

15 16 17

14

I have a guy named James Kowalsky who would like to speak to us. Are you still here, James?

18 19 20

MR. KOWALSKY: I'm here.

21 22

23

24

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, come on up to this mic here. Hit the little button there on that mic so your little red light comes on and go ahead and tell us what you need us to hear.

25 26 27

2.8

29 30

31 32

33

34

MR. KOWALSKY: I didn't expect to get called so quickly, but thank you. Mr. Chairman and Members of the RAC. My name is Jim Kowalsky. I'm a retired guy with a sore leg. What I'm going to do is just call your attention to a letter that we -- and when I say we, I'm speaking of an organization which we refer to as Alaskans For Wildlife. It's a wildlife advocacy group in Alaska that I submitted earlier this year.

35 36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

This is in respect to WP18-51, which is actually a proposal from the Eastern Council, but it's a statewide proposal. I guess I don't need to re-read the letter. I wanted to come just to reemphasize that we are opposed to this proposal, particularly as it regards public safety. This would be concerning using human food for bear baiting. It's primarily a public safety matter with us.

The comment that we submitted is on Page 13 in this summary. There I state that it's a statewide organization. We strongly oppose Proposal 18-51 which proposes to allow Federally qualified

49 50

subsistence hunters to add the use of human produced foods and scent to presently permitted use of biodegradable materials used to bait bears on all public Federal lands.

So I guess I'm not going to take your time to reread what we submitted then, but in general we are opposed to this proposal particularly on the basis of human safety. There have been recent certainly good examples in late summer of human fatalities caused by bears. So we see on one hand the Department of Fish and Game urging people not to leave garbage out and not to leave food around and on the other hand the Board of Game makes bear baiting possible, so it seems a conflict.

2.0

So, if you would, please maybe just consider this point of view. You did ask for public participation, which is why I'm here. I'd like to point out that, if I may take a moment, quite some time ago I was a subsistence director for Tanana Chiefs Conference. I did it for seven years. Pollock Simon will remember me, probably Ray Collins as well, so I am familiar.

2.8

My input into this position that the organization takes is substantial, but I want you to know I'm surely not an expert, but I did have quite a lot of experience in the 1980s with the TCC region and probably six fish and game advisory councils to which I gave technical assistance.

I'd also like to point out that the reason you guys are here is because of Title VIII in ANILCA and I was one of what I call ANILCA lawyers in the 1970s. I was one of the Alaskans who helped put together what was called the Alaska Coalition, which became a huge nationwide effort to pass ANILCA. The Title VIII, the subsistence title of ANILCA, may I say was born in part in an Irish bar near the capital in Washington, D.C. where I and a few others, including Don Mitchell, the attorney for AFN at the time, cooked up Title VIII.

Now I know also the public agencies involved in ANILCA also had a great deal to do with this, but this came from a grassroots effort. It's interesting now, many years later, for me to look back to those days when we thought Title VIII was a great

idea. So here you all are and I just want you to know I'm not totally removed although I'm a suburban Fairbanksan who doesn't actually hunt or fish, but I did understand very close resource politics, which is why I went to work for Tanana Chiefs Conference.

So I'm just saying this comes with a background of close association with what you folks are doing. In any case, please consider the fact that bear baiting is not a great idea from a public safety point of view.

And also if I may I'd like to point out that these are Federal public lands and there's a broad interest beyond subsistence for rural people, which of course is important. That's what Title VIII is all about and that's why it's there because we consider that is really important to do.

2.8

But these are public lands and there is a broad public interest that goes beyond the discussions that I've seen in transcripts particularly for the Southeast Alaska Regional Council. My God, they went on for 125 pages and no one ever uttered a word of recognition that -- in that case, they're dealing with Tongass National Forest, public lands, a broad public interest. So please don't lose track of the fact that you can get a lot of good support from the public if you don't do something, if I may say, kind of crazy like baiting bears.

I know it's traditional and so I'm sorry if I'm insulting people. I don't mean to do that. There is a wide consideration of what you're doing and I would like to think that if you act responsibly in the public eye, you'll do okay, but please avoid controversy if you can. We say that bear baiting is very controversial.

I'm going to conclude with that.

I don't want to go on and on.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. Does any Council Members have questions of Jim.

Pollock.

MR. SIMON: I want to mention also I

sit on the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and the villages in that area have been always opposed to bear baiting because afraid that animals would come to the town looking into trash barrels and looking for food. So we have been opposed to bear baiting most of the time.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. KOWALSKY: So you're saying habituating bears to human food is a concern for Allakaket and Alatna, right? It is an issue.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Darrel.

MR. VENT: Yeah, I'd like to thank you for mentioning that. That brings a problem back in the village that we're having right now where the bears are starting to come into the village. So it's probably one of the reasons why they're starting to move toward our village. I guess they must have been baiting them somewhere and they moved into our area and they just go right for the village.

hear that.

MR. KOWALSKY: That's interesting to

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I thank you for your comments.} \\$ 

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  KOWALSKY: You're welcome. Thanks for letting me speak.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're quite welcome. Do we have any tribal comments or any other public comments at this time? I always have the floor open and available each morning.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see anybody jumping up and down.

So old business.

The Caribou Work Group.

Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through the Chair. This subject came up as a result of a request that dates back to December of 2016. At that time there was concern by not only this Council but several other Councils who collectively in one form or another utilize caribou resources for -- I should say by Federally qualified subsistence users. The region that I'm discussing in particular includes not only the Western Interior Region, but also the Seward Peninsula, Northwest Arctic and North Slope Regions.

At that time in December 2016, there was concern about the decline in the Unit 23 caribou herd, which includes portions of not only the Teshekpuk Herd, but also the North Slope and also portions of the Mulchatna Herds. At that time there was an interest in providing a means for those associated Regional Advisory Councils to share information and through the sharing of that information help to provide for hopefully a more coordinated management across Federal public lands of that resources.

2.8

In order to share information and do so in a manner that is in accordance and compliance with Federal law, particularly ensuring that information shared is done in a public fashion, it was recognized that the formation of such a group had to be done on the record. So at that time in the winter of 2016, a teleconference was held with the various Chairs of those four associated regions. Again those being the Western Interior, North Slope, Northwest Arctic and Seward Peninsula herds. This Council was at that time represented by the Vice Chair, then Ray Collins, who discussed the formation of that group, and all groups expressed interest in forming that body.

 Now it is at the discretion of this Council to decide whether or not on the record it chooses to formulate that group. Again the purpose of this, in this case so-called Caribou Working Group, but again would be to provide for the sharing of information that affects caribou on Federal public lands. This would not be a decision-making body.

Any information shared by this group would be brought back to the attention of the Council for its purposes, whatever those might be, and the sharing of that information would need to be done telephonically, specifically there are not monies or

funds available to meet in person, but that would need to be done telephonically.

This Council, should it choose to formulate that group, would need to appoint members to serve on that body and they could meet telephonically with other Councils as it saw fit, when it saw fit.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Zach. I think it would behoove this Council, it would be beneficial to this Council to work with the other Regional Councils that we overlap in jurisdiction on those Western Arctic, Teshekpuk, Central Arctic Caribou Herds. Mulchatna also. We overlap with them with the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council.

2.0

I would like to meet telephonically with those Councils to get on the same sheet of music and start talking about real management of caribou. There's a lot of misinformation that floats around in these Councils. When we had that big joint meeting down there in Anchorage, I was talking to Bristol Bay and they had some misperceptions about Mulchatna and what some of the biological parameters were of Mulchatna.

 So I would like to have our biological staff on the conference call with current data and I would like those -- if we're going to talk about the northern populations of caribou, we should have Council members from our Council and the other Regional Councils telephonically to discuss these caribou issues so that we can start working in a more concise direction towards managing caribou.

So I would entertain a motion to join a Caribou Working Group for the northwestern portion that would be Seward Pen, Northwest Arctic RAC, North Slope and WIRAC. For the southern portion of our region, WIRAC, YK-Delta and Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Councils for Mulchatna.

MR. THOMAS: How many different herds does this involve?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There would be four main herds that would be involved in the discussion.

The Northwest Arctic Herd, Teshekpuk, Central Arctic are the herds of concern because those have declined and Mulchatna is the other overlap. That's in your area down there.

MR. THOMAS: We haven't seen any caribou in our area in quite a few years now, so whatever we could do to get them to come back, if anything. Or it's just a natural occurring thing that they keep changing their migration, whether they work north or they work south or whatever, you know. It's just going to take a little time. Yeah, I think it would be a good idea.

 I will move that we set up a relation with these people, whatever we have to do so we get some feed into it, you know. It's just as much our concern as theirs.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council members that would be involved with the Mulchatna Herd, you, Ray, probably myself. Northwest populations, Western Arctic, Teshekpuk, Central Arctic, I would like to be on that work group also.

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair, I second that since he made the motion.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We have a motion. The discussion is the layout. Who is going to be -- we should have at least three members from each Council on the call and then the Council would appoint membership to each one of those. There's going to be two different work groups because it's two different -- people in the southern portion of our region are not going to be real interested in the northern caribou, vice versa.

Darrel. Discussion.

 MR. VENT: I just wanted to add on that. We used to have caribou come right into our yard, running into our clothes line, get caught on our clothes lines. Then we came into ANILCA and they said, oh, we're going to put the pipeline here and it's not going to affect your herd, there's not going to be no difference. There's going to be caribou all over the place. Once they put the pipeline in we noticed a dramatic decrease in caribou.

They weren't coming into our area any more. The only ones that were coming in was from the Northwest Arctic Herd or the Teshekpuk Herd. We lost that migration pattern and they said that wasn't going to affect us, but we knew that wasn't right.

One of my grandfathers, Edwin Simon, he argued quite a bit about that before he passed on. He encouraged me, you guys got to get an education. Go out there and start speaking for our people. That's just some of the concerns that I see. How are we going to make them come back from something when they said that -- you know, they made a promise saying, oh, no, it's not going to affect the herds, but it did. That was on record.

Now we're dealing with caribou where we have to go all the way over to Selawik to catch a caribou. It's time consuming, costs a lot of money for the parts that you have to pay for your snowmachine to get over there, the amount of gas. Fuel prices over there is 11, 12 dollars a gallon, so it's not cheap. You know, we love all that caribou meat. That's some of the subsistence that we use. Moose, caribou and some of the fish. Now we're basically depending mainly on moose now.

Those are some of the things that I think are concerning to our area and that's one of the things that I'm willing to address if need be.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Darrel. Well, conservation of caribou, the larger the herd, the more distance the herd has to cover. The bigger the herd, the more distance they cover, they feed more people. I'm an advocate for maintaining large herds.

 Caribou eat cotton grass, flowers, flowering forbs and willow leaves in the summertime. These managers get way over-fixated on the summer range. They're going to eat themselves out of house and home. No, those are very productive plants. The winter range is lichen. The bigger the herd, the more lichen they have to have, so they cover more distance. There's an untapped amount of lichen in the Interior of Alaska. Caribou used to use and apparently there used to be phenomenally huge caribou herds in the Interior

of Alaska before the Gold Rush when they had market hunting that shot them out and various other problems.

Caribou, the bigger the herd, the more distance they'll cover. Forty-Mile used to cover lots of country. Western Arctic and the Arctic Herds used to cover a lot of country. Mulchatna and that Southwest population used to go all the way to the Yukon River. You can see the trail etched on the tops of the ground all the way through the Kuskokwim Mountains. There used to be phenomenally huge herds. Those are documented where they had to tie steamboats up at Ruby because there was too many caribou swimming across the river coming out of the south.

We need to have large herds because they feed more people. That's the kind of discussion I want to talk about with these other Councils is let's rebuild these herds to these larger populations and let's maintain them. No, shoot them all out and wipe them down to low numbers where they get below their predator thresholds.

We want to recover these herds and maintain them at large population, then they feed a lot of people. That's the kind of discussion we need to have. People have to understand the biology of these caribou.

floor.

So we have a motion and a second on the

We have a couple more comments.

Pollock.

MR. SIMON: Yeah, I sit on a Caribou Working Group. We have an annual meeting in December. It's a large group of people all along the coast. Me and Benedict Jones represent Koyukuk River. Folks always comment a lot of wolves and grizzly bears in the area that's eating a lot of caribous and that's part of the reason the caribou decline. The populations kind of fluctuate quite a bit. It's low sometimes and they come back up sometimes.

But I mentioned that to increase population you could do well by dispatching some wolves and grizzly bears, but the State and Federal agencies

are opposed to doing wolf control and bear control to increase the caribou population.

Well, the people in the area depend on meat and caribou meat is their main diet on the coast. It seems like if there's a decline in some kind of animal population, the subsistence users are always cut back first. We don't always use a lot of caribou. Wolves and bears kill lots of it too. That's why I said to do well by dispatching some wolves and grizzlies.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock.

Don.

2.0

MR. HONEA: Yeah, just real quick. My recommendation, if we're looking for members to sit on this working group, is to get any members off of here that has direct capacity, like Pollock and like here for the Mulchatna Herd, and to use them if they so wish.

2.8

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's my understanding. We're just passing a motion to form the working group and at a future time we'll set the membership. Correct?

MR. STEVENSON: Pardon me, Mr. Chair. Close. My understanding is that there's two issues that need to be addressed now. One is who would serve on this body from this Council and secondarily does this Council move to adopt that body, this working group.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have a motion to adopt the bodies and then after that motion I'll take another motion to appoint the membership to those bodies. There will be two different bodies.

Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: Now 15, 20 years ago when that herd was really large and was moving through our area back there, there were people bringing plane loads

of hunters out from town. One time I was coming off from Anchorage and they landed at Osprey Lodge up there somewhere on the Holitna and they must have dropped off 10 or 15 people there to go hunting and they had a whole bunch of people at camp already. Now this puts a lot of pressure on that kind of a herd.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

1 2

3

4 5

> So if this starts building up again, somehow or another we could try and work with the State to keep those numbers down. Now I don't know how many you could take from the herd. There might be some way to do it. But I remember there was an awful, awful lot of out of state, non-Native, whatever you want to call it, alien-type hunters that were coming in. I mean a whole plane full of them. I would rather not see that kind of a pressure on that herd again.

2.0

21

24

25

26

For years they came right through the village like we talked about and now I haven't seen one in years. And these numbers, okay, the bigger they spread out, they get smaller and then they shrink up.

22 23

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Mulchatna was 200,000 caribou and it was dropped to 28,000. So of course they don't go nearly as far. They don't go to your country anymore because there's not that many caribou anymore.

27 2.8 29

30

31

MR. THOMAS: Well, somebody Right. made a rumor one time there were 400-some-thousand caribou in that herd.

32 33

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's

misinformation.

34 35 36

MR. THOMAS: I don't know whether it

was.

37 38 39

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That was

misinformation.

40 41 42

I mean this is just what MR. THOMAS:

43 came to us.

44 45

46 47

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's why we have to have these work groups because we get current information, everybody gets on the same sheet of music with facts.

48 49

```
Page 49
                     So we have a motion on the floor to --
 2
     real quick.
 3
 4
                     MR. ALEXIE: Mr. Chair. I'd like to
 5
     make a motion to.....
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        We have a motion on
 8
     the floor.
                 We have a motion that we have to address
 9
     right now.
                 The motion on the floor right now is
     to....
10
11
                                  To accept the group?
                     MR. ALEXIE:
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....formulate two
14
     different work groups for Mulchatna and the Northwest
15
     Arctic and including various Regional Councils that
16
     would be affected. That's the first motion.
17
18
19
                     MR. ALEXIE:
                                  Okay.
20
                     MR. HONEA: Question.
21
22
23
                     MR. ALEXIE: Okay, I'll make that
     motion then.
2.4
25
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, it's already on
26
     the floor.
                 That's already been.....
27
2.8
                                Call for question.
29
                     MR. VENT:
30
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We need a question
31
     on that. Darrel calls the question on that main
32
33
     motion. Those in favor of the main motion signify by
34
     saying aye.
35
36
                     IN UNISON:
                                 Aye.
37
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.
38
39
                     (No opposing votes)
40
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Now to appoint to
     the Northwest Work Group, which would be for Northwest
43
     Arctic Caribou, Teshekpuk, Central Arctic, we should
44
45
     have at least three members from this Council.
     like to be on the Northwest Council for sure.
46
47
48
                     MR. VENT: If it's available, I would
     like to be on there too.
49
50
```

```
CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Darrel, myself,
 1
 2
     Northwest. Pollock, you're on the Northwest Arctic
     Caribou Work Group. Do you want to be on the Council's
 3
 4
     -- work with these other Advisory Councils on the
 5
     caribou?
 6
 7
                     MR. SIMON: I would be interested to
     listen.
 8
 9
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's a conference
10
11
     call, so you'd just be on the phone.
12
13
                     MR. SIMON:
                                 Okay.
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....when we meet.
16
17
                     MR. SIMON: But I'm already on the
     Caribou Working Group. Would it be better if you choose
18
     somebody else to give somebody else an opportunity to
19
2.0
     be on the board. But if nobody else, I'm interested.
     Thank you.
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, you live in
23
     the northern part. It's us guys in the northern part
2.4
25
     of the region that would be on that work group.
     know about those caribou.
26
27
                     MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Chair.
                                                 Through the
2.8
             To clarify for Member Simon.
                                           The intent behind
29
     Chair.
30
     this Caribou Working Group is different from what
     currently exists at the -- in this multi-agency caribou
31
     working group which you're involved in, Mr. Simon, in
32
33
     that this body would focus exclusively on involving the
     Regional Advisory Councils. That's it. It's to
34
     facilitate or provide for information sharing amongst
35
36
     the Councils. It's a bit of a narrower scope just to
     make that distinction clear.
37
38
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that
42
     clarification, Zach.
43
                     So those in favor of the main motion
44
45
     signify by saying aye.
46
47
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
48
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.
49
50
```

Page 51 (No opposing votes) 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appointment to the Northwest Regional Council conference call. I would 4 5 like to be on that, Darrel stated that he would like to 6 and Pollock. You hunt caribou, don't you, Fred? 7 MR. ALEXIE: No. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. 10 So is that agreeable to the Council? We need a motion to appoint 11 those members to the Northwest.... 12 13 14 MR. THOMAS: Can you say those names again. 15 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It would be myself, Darrel and Pollock. 18 19 20 MR. THOMAS: Okay. 21 MR. HONEA: I make a motion to it. 22 23 24 MS. PELKOLA: Second. 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion and seconded. 26 Those in favor of that signify by saying aye. 27 2.8 29 IN UNISON: Aye. 30 31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign. 32 33 (No opposing votes) 34 35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And then the 36 Southwest Work Group that would include Yukon Delta, Bristol Bay and Western Interior. 37 38 For Mulchatna Herd would be Dennis. 39 40 41 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, Crooked Creek. 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Ray. 44 45 MR. THOMAS: Ray, yeah. 46 47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to be on 48 there, Ray? 49 50

Page 52 MR. COLLINS: If it's just audio 2 conference, I could. Yes. 3 4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. Okay. And I 5 would join that group. 6 MR. THOMAS: Well, you know, this kind 7 of stuff really interests me to do something, but all 8 9 these facts and numbers and stuff I don't have at my fingertips. 10 11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's going to be 12 13 provided by our staff. 14 15 MR. THOMAS: Okay. 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't worry about 18 that part. 19 2.0 MR. THOMAS: I'd be more than happy to do it. I'd like to do it. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 23 Okay. Do we have a motion to appoint those members. 24 25 MS. PELKOLA: Make a motion to appoint 26 them. 27 2.8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion by Jenny. 29 30 31 MR. VENT: Second. 32 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Darrel. The membership would be Dennis, Ray and myself. 34 35 36 Those in favor of that motion signify by saying aye. 37 38 39 IN UNISON: Aye. 40 41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign. 42 43 (No opposing votes) 44 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that covers that Caribou Work Group. Kuskokwim Partnership Project. 46 Stewart is going to be on the phone. Are you on the 47 phone, Stewart? Do we have staff for this one? 48 49 50

MR. STEVENSON: Through the Chair. 1 2 Jack, I believe we either had Stewart Cogswell or Carol Damberg available telephonically to address the 3 4 Kuskokwim status update. 5 6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Come up to the mic. 7 8 MS. DAMBERG: Hi. My name is Carol 9 Damberg. I'm the Regional Subsistence Coordinator. Formerly it was Trevor Fox in this position. So I'll 10 speak on behalf of the Kuskokwim Partnership unless 11 Stewart Cogswell or Karen Clark -- was somebody trying 12 to come in? 13 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Anybody on the phone to speak about the Kuskokwim Partnership Project? 16 17 (No comments) 18 19 20 MS. DAMBERG: Okay. I'll go ahead. There's not a lot to report. We are in progress 21 working on the charter as well as trying to develop 22 what they call a terms of reference document for an 23 24 agreement with the State. The goal of the project is 25 to try to bring together the Intertribal Fish Commission and the Kuskokwim Working Group as one 26 entity to try to help inform the management of the 27 salmon on the Kuskokwim and working with the in-season 2.8 manager, Ken Stahlnecker of Yukon Delta National 29 30 Wildlife Refuge. 31 32 So it's in progress. We had hoped to 33 have something for the RACs to look at this go-round, but we're now hopeful that it will be in the winter 34 instead. So we don't have anything to present in 35 36 writing at this point. 37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be 38 Okay. more appropriate at our winter meeting, which moves 39 more towards the fishery. 40 41 42 MS. DAMBERG: So that's what I've got. 43 44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That was 45 beneficial. Thank you. 46 47 Carl. 48 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair and for 49 50

everybody on the phone, Carl Johnson with OSM. I just wanted to say why I was here sitting next to Carol. That is I've just been recently brought in to the team that's working on this because we're kind of moving in closer to the implementation stage. I'm going to be working on this moving forward. So I will likely be a point of contact on this for the Councils affected in the future.

8 9 10

1 2

3

5

6

7

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11 12

13

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. We'll call Thank you. So we're on new business, which is Wildlife Proposals. So Lisa. Is she....

14 15 16

I'll go get her. UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:

17 18

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. She's on.

19 20

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. Do we have a page on that?

21 22 23

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: She's going to lay it out for us. She has a plan, a road map of how to deal with all these.

25 26

24

Go ahead, Lisa.

27 2.8 29

30

31 32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

MS. MAAS: Thank you. For the record, my name is Lisa Maas. I'm a wildlife biologist with Office of Subsistence Management. I know WP18-32 is listed first on the agenda, but that's related to a bunch of other proposals, so the recommendation is to start off with 33/36 and then move WP18-32 to the end of the Western Interior Region proposals and cluster those with the other caribou proposals. That includes 48, 49, 57, 46, 47 and then 45. So all those proposals kind of have a lot of overlapping information. So it probably makes the most sense to consider all those proposals together and then start off with 33, 36.

40 41 42

43

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I like that plan. So we're going to start off with WP18-33 and 36. What page is that in our book here?

44 45 46

47

MS. MAAS: It's in your supplemental materials packet in your binders. I don't know if there's page numbers.

48 49

MR. STEVENSON: Through the Chair. There were a significant number of wildlife proposals and related analyses that we're reviewing. As you came in the front door there, they're arranged sequentially in numeric order. That's when you come in the right-hand side of the room. So for those that are looking for proposals, a printed copy, they are available as well at the front door for members of the public.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In our book it's hard to find the proposals. The pages aren't numbered here, so we can't like leaf right to it. That would be about a quarter of an inch into your packet you'll find WP18-33/36 combination. Unit 21E moose.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,

Lisa.

2.8

MS. MAAS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. Again for the record my name is Lisa Maas and I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for WP18-33/36. Proposal WP18-33 was submitted by the Western Interior Council and requests that the Unit 21E moose season be shortened 12 days from August 25th to September 30th to September 1st to September 25th.

Wildlife Proposal WP18-36 was submitted by the Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, Holy Cross Fish and Game Advisory Committee, or GASH AC, and requests the same season changes as Proposal 33 and also that a State registration permit be required.

The Western Interior Council states that the proposed season change would reduce regulatory complexity and user confusion by aligning State and Federal moose seasons in Unit 21E. The GASH AC states that the different State and Federal moose seasons and permit requirements leads to user confusion and that the proposed changes should not affect subsistence use or the moose population. The proponent also notes that a registration permit hunt will provide more accurate harvest information and that few Federally qualified subsistence users hunt during the August season.

In 2014, the Board of Game adopted

Proposal 60 to require a registration permit for moose in Unit 21E. A harvest ticket is currently required under Federal regulations.

In 2017, the Board of Game adopted Proposal 76 to change the State moose season in Unit 21E to September 1st to September 25th. Proposal 76 was submitted by the GASH AC with the intent of aligning State and Federal moose seasons. The Unit 21E moose population increased in 2016 meeting management objectives. The bull/cow ratio is high and well above management objectives. The calf/cow ratio has been above or within management objectives. Browse surveys and twinning rates indicate that habitat is not limiting this moose population.

2.0

Moose are an important subsistence resource for local communities evidenced by the vast majority of local households using moose in a given year. Over the last 25 years reported moose harvest has averaged 147 moose per year. However, many harvested moose are not reported.

2.8

The Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan estimated the total Unit 21E moose harvest as 340 moose, which is still within management objectives. Reporting rates improved dramatically in 2014 when the State required registration permits. 72 percent of reported moose harvest has occurred in mid September or only 10 percent has occurred in late September.

Adoption of this proposal would reduce opportunity for Federally qualified subsistence users by shortening the moose season in Unit 21E. While there is no biological reason for this, a shorter season would reduce user confusion and regulatory complexity by aligning State and Federal seasons and reduce law enforcement concerns due to the checkerboard pattern of land ownership in Unit 21E.

 Additionally, this request came from the Western Interior Council and GASH AC, which represent local subsistence users. Requiring a registration permit would also reduce user confusion by aligning State and Federal reporting requirements and could result in more accurate harvest data. However, concurrence would be needed from the State to allow Federally qualified subsistence users to use a State registration permit.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support WP18-36 with modification to clarify the regulatory language for permit requirements during the fall season and to remove the regulatory language referring to permit conditions and season closures for the winter season and delegate authority to set permit conditions and announce season closures for the winter season via a delegation of authority letter only and to take no action on WP18-33.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would be happy to field any

questions.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How much harvest was occurring in the August portion of that hunt?

MS. MAAS: Very little. Let's see. Yeah, I think it was hardly any in August.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So trimming those days would have little effect.

2.8

MS. MAAS: Yeah, that is correct. I don't have the specific percentages for August, but 72 percent of reported harvest has occurred between September 9th and September 22nd while only 10 percent has occurred after September 22nd.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question future for the Board would be what that harvest would be previous in the August portion, you know. That's what the Board is going to want to know. If we trim those August days off, what have we lost. We've lost a couple of moose or five, but I don't think it's significant because we just had a lot of discussion on this Council about it's so hot it's hard to keep meat as it is let alone in August. Our Federal season opens on August 25. I don't even think about shooting a moose. It's really hot and really buggy.

 Any questions for Lisa on the proposals. OSM's preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal 33, our proposal, and then they have this modified language, which I support.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: These dealings with areas that I'm not familiar with, so if there was anybody that had anymore information on this proposal that was put in by GASH, maybe that would explain more of what's going on here, but I don't see anyone here besides Lisa's information. So I can't speak on anything on behalf of that, but wish they had more involvement in this.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, Fred lives down in that country. We're going to look at Fred.

MR. ALEXIE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I kind of like that idea of changing it and I think it was brought up by our tribe at one time and I think Nulato Tribe introduced a proposal similar to that also. Because it's wanton waste for us with an earlier season, the August season. In September, if it was any normal year, it would have been ideal.

Like I say, we're all going through major climate change, so we've got to learn to adapt, write our proposals accordingly to whatever. Otherwise we're going to have too much wanton waste and I can't see wasting any kind of game, which is so valuable to all of us subsistence users or anybody really.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: When I moved back to the Kuskokwim in 1973, the moose season opened the 20th through the 25th of August and then they found that some guides down there were piling the meat up and piling the meat up, then they were selling the meat out. Well, not really selling it. They chartered from where to where and then it was caught and brought to the attention of the State. So that's when they changed it to September 1st in our area. I don't know why it wouldn't be fairly easy to do in an area up where you're at right now. Because the State did that arbitrarily.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're in the introduction of the proposal and the analysis. My question is do you have any questions for Lisa on the proposal. Is the proposal clear in your mind?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Now we're going to go for what does the tribes say. There was a conference call with the tribes and hopefully there's some input from the tribes. Do we have any comments from the tribes or do we have any tribal members in the room or on the phone that would like to speak to these proposals.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: The one thing on there is the clarity on the permit situation. I didn't have any information on because -- see they want to introduce a permit situation for the winter season hunt, is that what it's stating on there?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Board of Game implemented a State registration permit as required for that unit, so that's -- people are getting that to hunt the river corridor already and this would make the same permit apply to the Federal lands, correct?

MS. MAAS: Yes, that is correct. This is a State registration permit for the fall season.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock.

MR. SIMON: I would support this proposal, the GASH AC proposal. We don't have members from that area now. Robert Walker retired last year, so he can't speak to this proposal, but I support the people that proposed it.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Through the Chair. One minor correction. This Council currently does have one member from the affected area and that would be Shirley Clark from Grayling. Unfortunately she's not here in person, but is participating telephonically.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Have you gotten word from her or why she's not on the phone?

MR. STEVENSON: I believe she's on the

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 10/10/2017 Page 60 phone now. 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you on the 4 phone, Shirley? 5 6 (No response) 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: She wasn't on the 8 9 phone earlier. 10 MS. PELKOLA: Mr. Chair. 11 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Jenny. 14 15 MS. PELKOLA: I would also support this 16 proposal. 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're not in 18 19 deliberation yet. I'm trying to get down the list 2.0 here. I'm trying to get the tribal comments. I guess there were none. So now I'll go to the Alaska 21 Department of Fish and Game agency comments. 22 23 Go ahead. 24 25 MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair. This is Lem 26 Butler. Can you hear me? I'm on the phone. 27 2.8 29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, I hear you, 30 Lem. 31 32 MR. BUTLER: How are you doing? Again, 33 I'm Lem Butler with the Alaska Department of Fish and I'm the Assistant Director for the Division of 34 Wildlife Conservation. I believe we have Josh Peirce, 35 36 who is our local area biologist on the phone as well to speak to the proposal. Just as a way of introducing 37 the comments that you're going to hear from the State, 38 we really appreciate the opportunity to participate in 39 this process and to offer our comments on these 40 41 upcoming proposals. 42 43 All of our recommendations that you're going to hear at this point are still preliminary. 44 45 We're trying to gather information. We're interested in hearing what this Council has to share in terms of 46

local information, but we're here to share experience and expertise and give you an idea of where we think a good direction to go on some of these proposals might

49 50

47

be. So we'll be happy to help you as you go through the deliberation.

If Josh is on the phone, maybe he can address the proposals specifically.

 $\label{eq:comments} \mbox{Otherwise I'm happy to offer the State's comments.}$ 

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: State your name for the record.} \\$ 

MS. PARKER MCNEILL: My name is Doreen Parker McNeill, Management Coordinator for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I just did want to say that Josh is on the phone.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you there, Josh?

MR. PIERCE: Good afternoon, Jack. This is Josh on the phone here, yeah.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning, Josh.

2.8

Go ahead.

MR. PIERCE: Yeah, so I can speak to the proposal briefly. I've been listening to a few of the questions. I don't have the exact numbers for August. I can certainly get those. But to answer that question it's very small. In the last five years I'd be surprised if there were more than five moose shot during that August season. Like you guys talked about, people really don't hunt that early. It's warm still.

As the latter part of the season goes after the State season closes on the 25th, there is a short little window there and there is a little bit of harvest that takes place during that timeframe as well. As you guys know though, that's not the most popular time to hunt for folks out there. Those large bulls start to really get rutty, meat quality starts to go downhill again. It's also a very small percentage of people that hunt during that time as well.

So the bulk of the hunting takes place during what is the State season right now and as was pointed out by OSM we've had a registration permit now for the last several years that began in 2014. Harvest reporting really increased dramatically when that

system was implemented. Then we also added and quite happily to have the Federal harvest take place on that registration permit as it again improved harvest reporting significantly.

> 8 9

10

11

12

13

1 2

3

A lot of confusion before that. People were always calling up and wondering when they could hunt, where, what piece of land they could hunt on, where the Federal lands were, which are not that easily accessible via boat during the fall. In addition to that they needed to know if they had to have the green harvest ticket or registration permit. So it was lots of confusion. It's been a big improvement since we....

14 15 16

(Teleconference interruption participant phones not muted)

17 18 19

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Whoever is talking on the phone....

20 21

MR. COLLINS: Shirley.

22 23 24

25

26

27

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Shirley, don't talk over Josh Peirce is speaking right now. If you have to control kids or something, you can push \*6. We want to know what you have to say on this proposal also. just breaking in there.

29 30

Go ahead, Josh.

31 32

MR. PEIRCE: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

Chair.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

So basically what we've got right now is these two seasons like I said and the last couple years we've had a lot of improvement. However kind of the final step that the folks out in that area talked about making was trying to get the seasons in the fall aligned in their entirety.

40 41 42

43

44 45

46 47

48

So the GASH submitted a proposal to the Board of Game, which they adopted as you just heard, so the State season, which was the 5th to the 25th is now the 1st to the 25th. Part of the idea with that was to start to align the State and Federal seasons. That was kind of the first step and then the next step is obviously the WIRAC's proposal as well as the GASH's proposal to shorten the Federal season now so that they

would coincide exactly and it would be from September 2 1st to the 25th. 3 4 And then of course separate from all of 5 this there still is winter Federal season only, which allows the Federally qualified subsistence users of the 6 21E moose resource to hunt in the wintertime if they 7 were not able to catch their moose during the fall 8 9 season. So there's still that opportunity as well. 10 That's just a real brief overview, but 11 I'd be happy to answer other specific questions if I 12 13 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that information, Josh. Anybody have questions for Josh, 16 17 area biologist from McGrath. 18 19 (No comments) 2.0 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none here in 21 I think that the room. Any other State comments? 22 covered it. 23 2.4 25 What about Shirley? MR. COLLINS: 26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Shirley? 27 Yeah, well, she's not State. We'll get to Shirley in 2.8 deliberation. Any other Federal comments. 29 30 31 (No comments) 32 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Innoko Refuge 34 comments. 35 36 Jeremy. 37 MR. HAVENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and 38 Council Members. For the record, my name is Jeremy 39 Havener. I'm the Refuge Subsistence Coordinator for 40 Koyukuk/Nowitna/Innoko. I just wanted to get on record 41 saying that we do support this proposal. We understand 42. the challenges that go along with the Federal hunt and 43 trying to understand the land status and all the 44 45 confusion that goes along with that. 46 47 That was all I had. 48 49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. 50

```
Proposal WP18-36 with modification as in our book on
 1
 2
     Page 2, OSM's regulatory language as stated, September
     1 through the 25th, eliminating the August 25 and the
 3
     last portion September 30th. During September 1 to
 4
 5
     September 25 season a State registration permit will be
     required and striking all other language below during
 6
     the February 15 to March 15 season a Federal
 7
     registration permit is required and all other language
 8
 9
     would be deleted from the Federal regulation book.
     People see that on Page 2.
10
11
                     The Chairman is entertaining a motion
12
13
     to adopt that.
14
15
                     MR. GERVAIS:
                                   So moved.
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Tim.
18
19
                     MR. ALEXIE:
                                  Second.
2.0
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Seconded by Fred.
21
     Council comments. Are you there again, Shirley?
22
23
24
                     (No response)
25
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        I thought I heard
26
     her there a second ago. She comes and goes. Push *6
27
     Shirley so you could come back. I would like her
2.8
     comments on this.....
29
30
                     MS. CLARK: Okay, here I am.
31
                                                    I've got
32
     a new phone and I'm kind of doing a lot of stuff at
33
     once.
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right.
36
     cooking breakfast and a Council meeting at the same
     time?
37
38
39
                     MS. CLARK: No, I'm at the store
     managing -- I'm trying to sell a four-wheeler and write
40
     a receipt and find a phone.
41
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That sounds a heck
     of a lot more important than this.
44
45
46
                     (Laughter)
47
48
                     MS. CLARK: That's why I wanted to come
     to the meeting. Hello.
49
50
```

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So you have 1 2 comments on this proposal? This affects your area. 3 4 MS. CLARK: Which one was that? 5 didn't get the whole thing because I was running a 6 phone down. 7 8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The proposal 9 is to eliminate the August portion of the season for Unit 21E. It would go to the current State season of 10 September 1 through the 25th and there would be a State 11 registration permit would be required. Just like you 12 13 would have now on the State waters and State lands. You would use the same permit. This hunt would be in 14 15 conjunction with the Federal hunt. So basically it's a GASH proposal to align the State and Federal seasons. 16 17 Copy that? 18 19 MS. CLARK: Yes. I approve. 20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I just wanted 21 to see if you had any additional comments. There's a 22 motion on the floor.... 23 24 25 MS. CLARK: No, but I do have a big issue I'd like to address sooner or later when I get 26 settled down. 27 2.8 29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. But we're on 30 this proposal and we have a motion on the floor to adopt that proposal and the language I just stated. 31 Any further discussion. 32 33 34 (No comments) 35 36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Got a question. 37 MR. SIMON: Question. 38 39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of 40 Proposal WP18-36 as modified by OSM as stated on Page 2 41 42 of our book signify by saying aye. 43 44 IN UNISON: Aye. 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign. 46 47 48 (No opposing votes) 49 50

Page 67 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You have a positive 1 2 on that one, Shirley? 3 4 (No response) 5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, she said she 6 7 was kind of in favor. Okay. The proposal as modified is adopted by the Council. 8 9 MS. MAAS: You have to officially take 10 11 no action on 33. 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And no action taken on 33. State that for the record. 14 15 Go ahead, Lisa. 16 17 MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 18 up is Proposal 18-33, which should be in your 19 2.0 supplemental materials binder just right after 33/36. I'll give you all a moment to flip. 21 22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's after 33/36. 23 24 25 MS. MAAS: Yeah. 18-34. 26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, 34. You said 27 33. 2.8 29 30 MS. MAAS: Oh, did I? I'm sorry. Ι 31 meant 34. 32 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 18-34, which is the next proposal past the analysis that we just did. 34 35 a lynx proposal. 36 Go ahead, Lisa. 37 38 MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 39 for the record my name is Lisa Maas and I'll be 40 41 presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal 18-34. WP18-34 was submitted by Jack Reakoff 42 of Wiseman and requests that the closing date for the 43 lynx trapping season in Unit 24A be extended one month 44 45 from February 28th to March 31st. 46 47 The proponent states that the lynx resource in Unit 24A is currently under-utilized and 48 that lengthening the season would provide additional 49

harvest opportunity for Federally qualified subsistence users as well as reduce user confusion by aligning the Federal lynx and wolverine trapping seasons in Units 24A and 25, reducing incidental take of lynx.

Lynx are common in Alaska. Their populations fluctuate on an 8-11 year cycle in response to changes in snowshoe hare abundance, their primary prey. Currently lynx in Unit 24A are believed to be in the upswing of their population cycle.

Lynx are an important subsistence resource for Wiseman residents. Sixty percent of households reported using lynx in 2011. All harvested lynx are required to be sealed, which acts as a proxy for population status. Lynx harvest from Unit 24A fluctuates up and down in response to their population cycles. From 1999 to 2016 reported lynx harvest from Unit 24A ranged from a low of five in 2015 to a high of 286 lynx in 2000.

 Adopting this proposal would provide Federally qualified subsistence users with an additional month of harvest opportunity. Additionally, the Unit 24A lynx and wolverine trapping seasons would be aligned which would reduce regulatory complexity and incidental take of lynx. Although Federal and State lynx trapping seasons would be misaligned.

As lynx are cyclically abundant and their populations are primarily regulated by prey abundance, there are no conservation concerns for this proposal.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{The}}\xspace{0.5em}$  The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support WP18-34.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd be happy for questions.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions on the

Pollock.

MR. SIMON: The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee has been opposed to -- we always had a marten and lynx season ending February 28th due to warming

 proposal.

Marten and lynx start rubbing and shedding weather. their hair and not worth much. If this is Unit 24A, that's okay, but Unit 24B where I live it would be different. The fur buyers wouldn't pay too much for a lynx caught in March.

5 6 7

2

3

4

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This is 24A. season used to go to the 31st of March and up in the mountains we never have melting. We don't have melting at all in March. It doesn't even break freezing until the first part of April, so the lynx were in perfect shape. Then began the fad to reduce lynx harvest opportunities when lynx prices were 500 bucks a piece. They're not 500 bucks a piece anymore, so there's not a lot of huge numbers of trappers looking for lynx these days. But we continue to trap until the end of March for wolves so we'd have additional opportunity.

19 20 21

Any other questions on the proposal.

22 23

(No comments)

24 25

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have any tribal comments. Oh, Darrel, do you have questions on the proposal?

27 2.8 29

26

MR. VENT: Yeah. Under the proposed regulation it says Unit 19, 21.....

30 31 32

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. You're on the wrong proposal.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

MS. MAAS: Mr. Chair. It's just the way the trapping regulations are written. Multiple units have the same regulations. They're all listed together. So currently Unit 24 is listed with Units 19 and 21 because the regulations are the same. proposal is to change the regulations for Unit 24A. then you can see it drops down a different line for the proposal.

42 43 44

45

46 47

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 24A is a relatively small portion of Unit 24. It's basically the northeastern portion of Unit 24. That subunit is singled out as having a season extension, not the rest of the unit.

48 49

Any State comments. 1 2 3 Glenn. 4 5 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For 6 the record, my name is Glenn Stout. I'm the Galena 7 area biologist for the Alaska Department of Fish and I'll take a brief opportunity here to introduce 8 Game. Sara Longson. She's the new assistant area biologist 9 for the Galena Management Area. If you have any 10 questions, feel free to contact Sara if you can't get a 11 hold of me. 12 13 She's stationed here in Fairbanks. 14 15 She's a resident of Alaska. Lived in Tok, Homer and here in Fairbanks. So I think her interest and her 16 family's dedication to wildlife resources here in the 17 state makes her a great asset for the Department. 18 19 2.0 As far as the recommendations for Proposal 34, the Department is neutral on this 21 proposal. The proposed changes will not result in a 22 biological concern for lynx populations in Unit 24. 23 The minimal additional harvest is expected to be within 24 the sustainable limits of the lynx population. 25 26 That's all the comments we have. 27 2.8 29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any further 30 questions of the State. 31 32 (No comments) 33 34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn. 35 36 Welcome to the program, Sara. 37 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 38 MS. LONGSON: 39 MR. THOMAS: How would this later 40 41 affect the quality of the fur? 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In my experience, none. I trapped lynx to the end of March for years 44 45 before they changed the season and there's virtually no difference. In fact, they're way better in March than 46 they are in November. A November lynx is like 47 worthless. It's really short and it's brown. They 48 don't even get good quality until the middle of 49 50

December. So a lot of times I don't even trap lynx in November because they're no good. You want to catch a good lynx, they're way better in March than they are in November. They're real short, they're brown. They're a late primer as far as that silvery hair.

Go ahead.

MR. THOMAS: See, the thing is in our area there's not much trapping anymore. So that's why I asked that question.

There's things I'm not familiar with.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've trapped since I was five years old, so I've been trapping a long time and seen a lot of lynx. I've caught hundreds and hundreds of lynx. This year there will be thousands --next year there will be thousands of lynx in the Brooks Range. Literally thousands. They migrate in there. There will be thousands of lynx in the Brooks Range and additional harvest in March is inconsequential to the lynx population.

MR. STEVENSON: Question from Donald.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Donald.

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was going to ask Glenn and I'm a little confused here because I thought Pollock mentioned that going so late in the season that -- maybe I misunderstood his comment about -- I thought he mentioned that he was against it because it was so late in the season. And I was just wondering, you know, maybe the State's response to -- you know, it's probably interesting that you are farther north than us. I mean obviously, but it's a good question what kind of condition the fur is.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock stated that the 24A portion. He would not want it in 24B, but 24A was okay because it's actually further north. It's further up the drainage. The elevation keeps rising as you move up the drainage, so it's colder up there. It's a lot colder than it is down the Kanuti. The Kanuti gets warmed up really early, so they start to melt a lot sooner than we do. So we don't have that problem up there. That's why I singled it out as Unit 24A only.

Page 72 Any other questions of the State. 1 2 3 (No comments) 4 5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We're good. 6 Thanks. Any tribal comments. Do we have any comments on the conference call. Was there any comments at all 7 on that conference call? That's what I'm trying to 8 find out. 9 There was a conference call in September. Were any comments taken on any of these proposals? So 10 I don't have to keep reiterating that. 11 12 13 MS. MAAS: Through the Chair. This is Lisa Maas for the record. There were a couple 14 participants in the conference call, but no specific 15 comments on any Western Interior proposals. 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I'll stop 18 19 asking that then. Anybody in the room or on the 2.0 conference call, comments on the proposal. 21 (No comments) 22 23 2.4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Koyukuk River 25 Advisory Committee has not met on any proposals. 26 Any written comments. 27 2.8 29 MR. STEVENSON: No, Mr. Chair. 30 31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Regional Council recommendation. The Chair will entertain a motion to 32 33 adopt Proposal 18-34. 34 MR. HONEA: Motion to that effect. 35 36 MR. VENT: Second. 37 38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion and seconded. 39 Discussion. 40 41 42 (No comments) 43 44 MR. THOMAS: Question. 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is 46 47 called on.... 48 MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Chair. Pardon me. 49 50

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 10/10/2017 Page 73 Do you want to do Federal agency comments. 1 2 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, Federal agency 3 4 comments. Missed that one. Kanuti. Is Mike here? 5 There he is right there. 6 7 Okay, Mike, sorry about that. 8 9 MR. SPINDLER: For the record, Mr. Chair, Kanuti would support this proposal. Just to 10 inform the Council there is a lynx study going on at 11 several Interior Alaska Refuges participating along 12 with the University of Alaska that will get at some of 13 the population dynamics and movement patterns of lynx. 14 If the proposal gets funded and collars are purchased 15 this fall, we may have quite a bit more information in 16 17 a few years from now. 18 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 19 2.0 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that. 21 Appreciate that. And I guess National Park Service 22 would also have a comment. Marcy. 23 24 25 No comment. Okay. 26 We have a motion to adopt with 27 question. Those in favor of the Proposal 18-34 signify 2.8 29 by saying aye. 30 31 IN UNISON: Aye. 32 Opposed, same sign. 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 34 35 (No opposing votes) 36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal is adopted. 37 38 Our timeframe here, Zach. 39 40 MR. STEVENSON: It's five after 12:00. 41 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is the Council's wish to break for lunch and come back at 1:00. We'll 44 45 recess until 1:00. 46 47 Thank you. 48

49 50 (Off record)

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 10/10/2017 Page 74 (On record) 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll call the 4 meeting back to order. 5 6 (Waiting for Ms. Maas) 7 8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're on Proposal 9 18-35. Go ahead, Josh. 10 MR. REAM: Mr. Chair. I actually have 11 the talking points, so I can kind of pinch hit until 12 13 she gets in here. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go right Sure. ahead. 16 17 MR. REAM: Mr. Chair and Members of the 18 19 Council. My name is Joshua Ream. I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence 2.0 Management out of Anchorage. The proponent for this 21 proposal was the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and 22 they request that Federal regulations for moose in Unit 23 24B be adjusted to align with the recently adopted 24 25 State regulations for the winter season in this area. 26 These changes include the addition of 27 winter hunt in the John River drainage hunt area, 2.8 adjustments to harvest restrictions throughout the unit 29 30 and a requirement for State registration permits and harvest tickets rather than Federal registration 31 permits. This is part of a larger effort by ADF&G to 32 33 make moose regulations in this area more manageable given the checkerboard land status. 34 35 36 Should I pass this on to Lisa at the 37 moment? 38 39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Everything's good 40 now, Lisa? 41 42 MS. MAAS: Yeah, I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. 43 I asked permission to go pay for my meal and I just made it back. 44 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Riaht. 46 47 thought you were paying at the desk here and that was 48 like 15 minutes ago.

MS. MAAS: No, I had to go over to Pike's Landing and go to the bathroom. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We're on a tight agenda here, so I figured I'd just start the ball rolling on this proposal. So no big deal. He read the overview of the proposal. So we needed to get the ball rolling. I thought it was going to be like a couple minutes or something. I thought you were paying at the desk here. No big deal. Everything is good.

You got your page now, Dennis?

MR. THOMAS: Got it.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He read your overview. So continue with basically your overview of the proposal.

MS. MAAS: Okay. Again, I apologize for that. I'm going to start in with regulatory history. This proposal is part of a larger effort by ADF&G to make the moose regulations in Unit 24B more manageable. In 2016, ADF&G submitted Proposal 96 to the Alaska Board of Game requesting consolidation of all Unit 24B moose hunt areas and extension of the winter hunt to the entire unit. The Board of Game adopted Proposal 96 in February 2017 and this proposal requests similar changes.

 Moose occur at low densities within Unit 24B, but populations are believed to be stable. Since 1999 surveys in Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge have indicated high bull/cow and calf/cow ratios. However, surveys in Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve have yielded lower density and productivity estimates.

 Moose are an important subsistence resource to local residents and most communities across most survey years over 80 percent of households reported using moose in a given year while many moose harvested in Unit 24B are not reported. Only two moose have been reported during the winter season since its establishment in 2010. Additionally, few moose harvests have been reported in the upper drainage of Unit 24B near the Brooks Range where moose density and productivity appear to be lower.

Adopting this proposal would establish a winter season in the John River drainage hunt area, which would provide additional harvest opportunity to Federally qualified subsistence users although harvest would be restricted between December 15th and 31st to one antlered bull rather than one moose.

State harvest tickets would be required for the fall moose season while State registration permits would be required for the winter season. Aligning State and Federal reporting requirements and winter season dates would reduce user confusion and law enforcement concerns caused by the checkerboard pattern of land ownership in the area. However, concurrence is needed from the State to allow the use of State harvest tickets outside of State seasons and on Federal lands closed to those hunting under State regulations.

2.0

No conservation concerns exist for this proposal as no increases in harvest are expected due to the historically low moose harvest during the winter.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support WP18-35 with modification to retain the phrase hunting under these regulations.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions on the proposal from the Council.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: Kanuti is not -- is that around the Nulato area, Koyukuk area?

MS. MAAS: This is for the John River drainage. There's a map on Page 7 of the analysis. So you can see the checked hash if you're on Page 7. That upriver drainage from Bettles.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To Member Vent's question I did want to point out that Mike Spindler is also available to address any questions that would affect 18-35.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. We'll get

that under Federal. Darrel.

1 2 3

 MR. VENT: Yeah, it's just that I was kind of confused with this wording here. Using a State harvest ticket on a Federal registration permit is what's, you know.....

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It makes one permit. A hunter would have to have two different permits now. So this would make just one permit. That's what the objective of that is. Glenn Stout is here. He will speak to the proposal also.

MR. VENT: Okay. It's in Pollock's area, so I was just wondering where that was at.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That's in 24B. Clear on the proposal. Did we have any tribal comments from Allakaket Tribe, Zach?

Oh, go ahead, Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: What is the purpose of

2.8

this?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I'll have the State come up to the table. Glenn. So ADF&G comments. Sort of give a more finer detail. A little bit of confusion here with some of the Council Members.

Go ahead.

 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Glenn Stout with Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Just to address the two primary questions. The issue of permitting is to make a single permit. It's not uncommon that we have Federal hunts where the permit that is required is a State mechanism. So this is not anything new in that respect, having a State reporting mechanism. It just helps us consolidate the information as far as harvest reporting to where it's all put into one database, so it improves our ability to manage in that respect.

As far as what the proposal accomplishes, what it will do is it will help the hunter on the ground only have to worry about one set of regulations to look to because the State and the Federal regulations will be lined up. It will also

help them not have to worry about where they're at as far as land status because both the Federal and State land will have the same season, so they won't have to worry about which side of the line they happen to be hunting at any given time.

So this will just help simplify a lot of things that have been going on for quite a while actually. I thought the Staff's analysis of that did a real good job showing how we've been working on this for quite a while to progress towards this point to where the seasons and the areas and the permitting are now a lot simpler for the hunter.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Darrel, you've got a

2.0

question.

there.

MR. VENT: Yeah. What I was trying to lead to is, you know, it's a Federally qualified subsistence use area. The users use that for subsistence. As long as it -- it's not explained if it's opening to other qualified users or anything. It's just for a certain area.

That's all I'm concerned about on

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Glenn.

 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair. Member Vent. Yeah, this doesn't change any of who's qualified. This just makes it for Federally subsistence qualified hunters. They're only going to have to worry about one piece of paper.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: My thing is the length of the seasons. August 1 to December 14th, December 15th to April 15th. I've never heard of anything like this before.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We went through a long process to get those seasons. They're winter hunts designed for those in Unit 24B. The upper portion of that drainage of John River is basically lightly hunted by Nunamiut people out of Anaktuvuk Pass. Lightly. I'll state that explicitly because they primarily harvest caribou.

The winter hunt is for the people of Allakaket primarily and Bettles, Evansville. So there's not a huge amount of harvest. This is not a high-density human population area. These are low-density human populations with low density moose that need to have longer seasons to be able to meet subsistence needs. That's what those seasons are about.

MR. THOMAS: So the density of the animals is enough to support this length of a season?

2.8

MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Member Thomas. I think Jack's point was right on.
What we've demonstrated, because we've already had this winter hunt for seven years now, is that it provides an opportunity, but it is not used very often. It's kind of a back-up season I think is the way that we thought about it originally. If a hunter wasn't able to get their moose in the fall, this provided a winter opportunity.

Under the State portion of it, there are safeguards that are in place. Although it seems like a long season, you can't get access to the area very easily because it doesn't include 24A. So off the haul road there's no access. You can't use airplanes because that's a special hunt condition of that winter hunt, so they can't use airplanes in the area. Of course it's very dark and very cold for most of that time and that really restricts use.

We have bull/cow ratios on the order of 65-70 bulls per 100 cows, so the population can support additional harvest. I think we demonstrated already through the State permitting that this is certainly something we could support as far as a sustainable harvest.

MR. THOMAS: The permitting for this is to the local people? In other words, some guy from Anchorage come up there and wanted to get a permit to go hunting over there, you know, so he drives up with his car with four, five snowmachines on the back and vroom, run over there and.....

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's an allterrain vehicle restriction on the Dalton Highway within five miles of each side of the road. You can't

utilize all-terrain vehicles to transport hunters, game parts or gear.

MR. THOMAS: I understand that, but I'm saying this area up there. What would stop somebody from outside coming in and doing this?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's open, but they have winter hunts in Unit 20A and 20B, so they have winter hunting opportunity down here. People don't go all the way to the Brooks Range to go winter moose hunting. They go up there to go caribou hunting. I mean there is some participation, but it's really small nowadays with the kind of restrictions they have on the hunt.

Glenn.

2.0

MR. THOMAS: All right. If I could say just that the length of the seasons and open, all this and all that, it just seems strange to me because we don't have anything like this back there. We used to have a November hunt and then we had a February hunt and I think they did away with the November one and I think they did away with the February one back there too. Maybe they'll open it again. If this is what I -- I say Jesus Christ -- I mean goodness sake, you're looking at a six-month season, you know.

Okay, go ahead.

Enough said.

MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair....

MR. THOMAS: I'm in the dark. I just can't comprehend this length of time for a moose season.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You have hundreds of people that could participate. Allakaket is, what, 150 people, 140 people. Evansville is 25. Bettles is like 20 maybe. We're talking about low participation in a huge country. We're not talking about hundreds of people coming out of Aniak to come hunt over the top of you. You're mixing apples and oranges.

Go ahead, Glenn.

MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Member Thomas. I think your concerns were something that we were cautious about when we initially adopted the season and that's why we recommended to the Board that there be a sunset clause initially to gauge that interest. We watched that very closely and we had people interested in the hunt, but it was limited to about 25, 30 per year that people were interested in the hunt and they applied for and got the permit, but as soon as they saw what it took to get there, they didn't utilize the permits and we never saw a single moose harvested outside of the local harvest.

12 13 14

15

16 17

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

I think it looks appealing and it shows up on the books, but when people investigate it and what it really means to go up there in the dark at 30 and 40 below, it's not that much of an opportunity if you live outside.

18 19 20

## CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock.

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

2.8

29

MR. SIMON: Yes. The opportunity is there to take a moose in the wintertime, but I'll tell you this in wintertime there antlers fall off on the bull and you have to have some kind of binoculars or guess that is a bull moose. If it's a cow moose and you shoot it, you're in trouble. Besides it's 40 below out there and people go out in the boat in fall time before freeze-up to enjoy the weather and look for moose.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

The opportunity to take a moose in December -- there was only one moose taken a couple years ago during that season. Besides the bull moose -- you have to take a bull moose. We used to have cow season years ago, but the population dropped, so no cow season. But in the wintertime, December, January, a bull moose has lost all his fat and the bull moose around that time is tough meat. The opportunity is there to take a moose, but not too many people go out.

40 41 42

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43 44

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.

45 46

Fred.

47 48

MR. ALEXIE: Mr. Chair. I'd like to further comment on that. I know a lot of my friends

from that area come out and they actually tell us they can't get no moose because the moose aren't there in their area. But we're opening this area here for that winter hunt. They got a chance there to feed the family, feed the village. I've got no complaints about that opening, the time and the length of it. It's for their benefit, the people of that area. Bettles, Hughes, all that area.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Fred.

Don.

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just had a question for Glenn. I actually kind of like the idea of coming in line with the State and Federal because it takes confusion away where you're at. Am I on the checkerboard square of BLM, Native allotment or Doyon or whatever you have out there.

But I was just wondering -- I mean I realize that probably the winter take is not -- has it been consistently about 10, 15, 20? I realize we're not talking about big numbers here, correct?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Glenn.

MR. STOUT: Through the Chair. Member Honea. Yeah, I think we've had two moose reported harvested for the whole time that we've had that season.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the proposal is clear. The State gave their comment. Kanuti.

Oh, you've got further comment?

Go ahead.

MR. STOUT: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I was just trying to respond to the questions initially. I'll go ahead and give the State's comments.

The Department submitted and supports this proposal. The proposed language will align the State and Federal hunt boundaries for the winter moose season in Unit 24B, which was recently adopted by the

Board of Game. The alignment will eliminate confusion in areas with a checkerboard land ownership pattern, which occurs near the villages of Bettles, Evansville, Allakaket and Alatna.

Under current regulations subsistence hunters may unintentionally violate hunting regulations due to that differing land status. The proposed language will also eliminate the need for a Federal permit for any of the Unit 24 hunts during that winter period and simplify permitting for the Federally qualified users. Hunters will only be required to possess a State permit to participate in both the State and Federal seasons.

That's the end of our comments.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Is that

clear?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Kanuti. Go ahead,

Mike.

2.8

MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. Fellow Council Members. It might help if I painted a bit of a historical picture here. In the mid '90s to late '90s there was a Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan, which was a very inclusive process involving all the stakeholders. One of the things the plan did is it eliminated a cow moose hunt in that area and that's because it was felt by most of the experts that looked at the population that it was already low and it couldn't sustain a cow harvest.

 That was very difficult for the people in the villages because there was no opportunity for a backup, kind of a desperation, I don't have any meat situation. So it was very painful, especially in the years when the fall harvest success was really low. So it was requested of us probably around 2000 or 2003 or 4, somewhere in there, that we try a five-day winter hunt bulls only. That was tried and that wasn't a long enough period. There was a lot of interest, but people didn't succeed in encountering a moose.

 $$\operatorname{So}\ I$$  view this as a hunt that would afford the opportunity of someone that's going to their

wood lot, someone on the trapline, they see an antlered bull, opportunistically they didn't fill their harvest ticket during the fall hunt, it gives them that one last chance to get a moose that season and feed their family. Something that the Kanuti Refuge highly supports.

We've worked closely with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Mr. Stout, over the years to try and fine tune this so it is a reasonable good opportunity for the folks that really need a moose, but we recognize now that it's not getting overrun by non-local hunters.

Furthermore, in Allakaket, Kanuti
National Wildlife Refuge contracts with a tribal
employee, Steven Bergman, one of the elders in
Allakaket, his position that the tribe has hired that
we fund and he is the licensed vender for all State of
Alaska licenses and harvest tags. Also has been for
the Federal registration permit hunts as well.

So all the people in the largest villages that would be participating in this hunt have access to up-to-date information and Steven does an admirable job of making sure that the hunters are prepared, they know where they could hunt, where the boundaries are.

I don't see any complicating things that would cause me any concern at all. I just thought that maybe a little bit of historical background would help the Council Members understand why we got to this point at this date.

In summary, Kanuti Refuge highly supports this alignment with the State on this.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Mike. Appreciate that perspective.

MR. SPINDLER: I have one other item that I would like to add when you're done deliberating.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. It was good to give an overview because Dennis seemed to be confused about where this came from. You're new to this Council, so this has been like a long process for nearly 20 years. So it was good to give that overview

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 10/10/2017 Page 85 of that historical perspective. 1 2 3 Any questions for Kanuti Refuge. 4 5 (No comments) 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. 8 9 Go ahead. 10 MR. SPINDLER: I've had the pleasure of 11 working with this Council for several decades, since it 12 was formed in the early 1990s. As of this January I'll 13 be retiring from 40 years of service with the Fish and 14 Wildlife Service, so I wanted to let the Council 15 Members know. 16 17 I've really enjoyed working with you on 18 difficult issues like we just described. Not enough 19 moose meat to go around in the wintertime. We worked 2.0 through it. It takes time, it takes patience, it takes 21 understanding, it takes trust, it takes communications. 22 But 40 years service and I'm looking for some other 23 endeavors going forward and I just wanted to personally 24 let the Council Members know. 25 26 Finally, Lisa, you've done a great job 27 on your staff analyses. I really think you present the 2.8 data very clearly and understandably for all concerned. 29 30 So thanks for your work on this and thank you, Council Members. I know you serve as volunteers. Thank you 31 32 for all the work you've done to better subsistence 33 opportunities for rural residents in the state of Alaska. 34 35 36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Mike I wanted to state that I've been on the Council since '93, as some 37 of the members have. You worked out of Galena for many 38 years, Kanuti for many years, and we really appreciate 39 all the time and energy you've spent in working with 40 this Council and with the resources. 41 42 43 Appreciate that. 44 45 Thank you. 46 47 MR. SPINDLER: You're welcome.

been my honor.

48

(Applause) 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So as far as advisory committees, the advisory committee has not met 4 5 on this proposal. The Gates of the Arctic Subsistence 6 Resource Commission did have a conference call on this proposal and supported the simplification and 7 permitting process systems having it under the State 8 9 reporting requirements. So the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission did support this 10 11 proposal. 12 13 Do we have any written comments, Zach? 14 15 MR. STEVENSON: No, Mr. Chair. 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Public testimony. don't see anybody from that area in the room. Regional 18 Council's recommendations. The Chair will entertain a 19 20 motion to adopt Proposal WP18-35. 21 22 MR. HONEA: I so move. 23 24 MR. VENT: Second. 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Darrel. 26 Discussion on the proposal. 27 2.8 29 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I have a 30 comment. 31 32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray. 33 34 MR. COLLINS: You mentioned concern about the length of that season, but this is really a 35 36 more appropriate for subsistence users because when we have to set dates, especially for winter hunts, they 37 cause real problems because it may be 40 below during 38 that week and so on, where the next week it may be 39 higher, you know, with all the fluctuation. This gives 40 them an opportunity to pick when it's more appropriate 41 42 to hunt, which is more traditional. 43 You go out when the weather will allow 44 45 it. You don't have to look at a calendar and say well I've got this much time. So I'm glad that at least the 46 resources in this area will sustain this kind of 47 harvest and you don't have a lot of outside pressure. 48

49 50 I wish we had more flexibility like that in other areas

especially when nobody can go out. When you create a short winter season, then nobody can go out. really haven't been given an opportunity then.

3 4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

1 2

> So there needs to be in some of the Federal regs an opportunity for the local person to extend that season without going through a regulatory precess or something as a tool for consideration in the future, you know. They'd be able to say, well, there wasn't any participation. We'll extend it another week or whatever.

12 13

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A letter of delegated authority they call that.

14 15 16

Dennis.

17 18

19

22

23

24

25

26

29

30

31

32 33

34

37

38

39

40

41

42

MR. THOMAS: It helps when you understand the issues.

20 21

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, we weren't through all of the informational process. We can't start deliberating the proposal off the top of That's why we've got to get the State and all the agencies, all the information out in front of Then we can formulate the way we're going to vote.

27 2.8

I do agree with Ray. The first time it was five days. Well, it was 40, 50 below and nobody went out. Yeah, nobody is going to go out. But if you have a longer opportunity period then you can pick the weather especially for the winter hunts or any time. People put in for one week to go hunting in the fall time.

35 36

I don't hunt that way. I hunt when the conditions are proper to where I can kill a moose and put the meat away when it's dry. I'm not going to shoot a moose in pouring rain because I'm stuck in two days of a weekend or something. You've got to have the right kind of conditions to put the meat up right or sheep hunting or whatever I'm doing. I hunt when the conditions are right.

43 44 45

46 47

48

You have to have a long enough opportunity to where you can do that. So this gives that. It's not a cow, but at least it's something. I had no moose, I'd take a bull. We used to have a two moose limit when I was a kid. Any moose, two moose.

```
They built the haul road and we're down to real short
 1
 2
     seasons and one bull and we're lucky to get that.
 3
     Happy to get that.
 4
 5
                     So any further discussion on the
 6
     proposal.
 7
 8
                     MS. PELKOLA:
                                   Ouestion.
 9
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        The question is
10
     called. Those in favor of the Proposal 18-35 -- hold
11
          Back up. The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
12
     on.
     retain specific language hunting under these
13
     regulations. That is because of specific regulatory
14
     process within OSM.
15
16
17
                     Lisa.
18
19
                     MS. MAAS: Through the Chair. Yeah,
2.0
     that's more of an administrative modification.
     it just says retaining that phrase will be
21
     inconsequential. It's not contradictory to the use of
22
     a State permit. So I think it's just clarifying that
23
     we're talking about Federal regulations and not State.
24
     So it's really more of an administrative thing.
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll stay with the
27
2.8
     proposal as written. So that's the motion on the
     floor.
29
30
                     Those in favor of the motion signify by
31
32
     saying aye.
33
34
                     IN UNISON:
                                 Aye.
35
36
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.
37
                     (No opposing votes)
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is
40
     adopted. So we're on Proposal -- go ahead, Lisa.
41
42
43
                     MS. MAAS:
                                32.
44
45
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, 32.
46
47
                     MS. MAAS:
                                Thank you, Mr. Chair.
48
     now we're going to go back to WP18-32. This is kind of
     part of the suite of the Northern Caribou Herd
49
50
```

proposals, so there's a lot of overlapping information in the biology and harvest history between 32 and several other proposals.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that's the first proposal after the calendars in our packet. That's pretty lengthy.

MS. MAAS: I think that's the longest proposal and analysis in OSM history.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Apparently. That's

 biq.

MS. MAAS: Has everyone found it?

(Pause)

MS. MAAS: Getting there.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Lisa.

2.8

MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again for the record my name is Lisa Maas. Again there are five proposals concerning caribou regulations across the ranges of the Western Arctic, Teshekpuk and Central Arctic Caribou Herds, including WP18-32, 45, 46/47, 48/49 and 57. So these proposals will be presented consecutively and overlapping information, such as caribou biology and harvest, will only be presented once to reduce repetition and redundancy.

Some of these proposals directly affect the Western Interior Region while other proposals are crossovers and are being presented because some Western Interior residents have a customary and traditional use determination for caribou in the affected area.

First up is Wildlife Proposal 18-32. This proposal was submitted by the Western Interior Council and requests changes to the caribou season dates in Units 21D, 22, 23, 24, 25A (West), 26A, and 26B.

The proponent requested these season changes to protect cows during the migration, avoid migration deflections due to hunting and prohibit bull

harvest during the rut when bulls are unpalatable. The proponent also intends to submit an proposal to the Alaska Board of Game to align State caribou seasons with these proposed Federal seasons.

In 2015, the Alaska Board of Game restricted caribou regulations in Units 21D, 22, 23, 24, 26A and 26B in response to population declines of the Western Arctic and Teshekpuk Caribou Herds. In 2016, the Federal Subsistence Board adopted similar regulation restrictions across the ranges of these declining herds.

A lot of time and effort were spent in crafting both Federal and State regulation restrictions by herd and unit in response to local needs and seasonal caribou movements. In 2017, the Board of Game restricted regulations in Unit 26B in response to a population decline of the Central Arctic Caribou Herd.

This proposal affects units within the ranges of the Western Arctic, Teshekpuk and Central Arctic Caribou Herds. Caribou populations naturally fluctuate over time and all three herds are currently declining.

2.8

The Western Arctic population peaked at 490,000 caribou in 2003 and has since declined over 50 percent to approximately 201,000 caribou in 2016. Bull/cow ratios are within management objectives.

 The Teshekpuk Herd peaked at 69,000 caribou in 2008 and has since declined 40 percent to 41,500 caribou in 2015. The 2016 bull/cow ratio of 28 bulls per 100 cows was the lowest ratio since 1991 and is below management objectives.

The Central Arctic Herd peaked at 70,000 caribou in 2010 and has since declined almost 70 percent to 22,400 caribou in 2016. The 2016 bull/cow ratio of 39 bulls per 100 cows is just below State management objectives.

Caribou migration routes, timing and the number of caribou migrating on a particular route vary each year. Different caribou herds also have different migration patterns and timing. Caribou have been a vital nutritional and cultural resource for the Inupiag of the Seward Peninsula, Northwest Arctic and

North Slope regions for thousands of years and continue to dominate the subsistence harvest across most of the region.

3 4 5

> 6 7

8 9

1 2

> A long-held cultural practice is to allow lead caribou to establish migratory pathways undisturbed. Local hunters have expressed concerns over aircraft and non-local hunters disrupting caribou migration, which has caused user conflicts in the area.

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Harvest from the Western Arctic Herd approximates the estimated harvestable surplus for this herd. In 2016 the harvestable surplus was about 12,000 The long-term estimated annual harvest also caribou. averages about 12,000 caribou. On average, local hunters within the range of the Western Arctic Herd account for 95 percent of the total Western Arctic harvest while non-local hunters account for 5 percent. Most Western Arctic Caribou are harvested in Unit 23.

19 20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

2.8

Harvest from the Teshekpuk Herd may already exceed the estimated harvestable surplus for this herd. Currently the harvestable surplus estimate is 2,500 caribou. However, the estimated total harvest is about 3,000 caribou. On average, local hunters account for 99.7 percent of the Teshekpuk harvest while non-local hunters only account for .3 percent of the harvest. The vast majority of Teshekpuk Caribou are harvested in Unit 26A.

29 30 31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39

The harvestable surplus from the Central Arctic herd decreased dramatically with the recent population decline and has possibly been exceeded. However the 2017 restrictions to State regulations were geared at reducing harvest to sustainable levels. The vast majority of Central Arctic Caribou are harvested in Unit 26B by non-Federally qualified users. Most of the local harvest is by Nuigsut residents. Most of the caribou harvest in Unit 25A West is from the Porcupine Caribou Herd.

40 41 42

43

44 45

46 47

48

Adopting this proposal would increase regulatory complexity by misaligning State and Federal caribou seasons across several units. The effect of these regulation changes would be limited as all users could hunt under State regulations. One size fits all regulations are not appropriate. Two years ago a lot of time and effort were spent in crafting caribou regulations specific to caribou herd seasonal movements

and local needs.

For example, may-be-announced seasons were established in Unit 22 as caribou presence is less predictable in that unit. Unit 26A was divided into a north hunt area geared toward the Teshekpuk Herd and a southern hunt area geared toward the Western Arctic Herd. The Unit 24C and 24D cow season does not open until September because caribou are not present in those units during the summer. The Unit 26A bull season opens December 6th as North Slope residents consider bulls palatable by then.

More time is needed to assess the effectiveness of these regulation changes before making additional changes. While the proposed season changes may avoid migration deflections and aid in population recovery by reducing cow harvest, migrating cow caribou could still be disturbed by users hunting bulls and it would put a substantial burden on Federally qualified subsistence users who must now distinguish between bull and cow caribou. Federal regulations would also become more restrictive than State regulations eliminating the subsistence priority.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to oppose Proposal WP18-32.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Go ahead, Darrel.

 MR. VENT: Yeah, just talking about a lot of decline in this population here. As you know, when you get decline in something there's also the predator factor in this because a lot of times those bulls are the breeding bulls and so they -- what I heard from over on the Kobuk area is that those predators are so bad that they chase them up in the hills and they didn't come down out of there, so that's why we didn't get no caribou over in our area. They just hid there. They couldn't do nothing with all the predators.

So people were catching predators, but it's pretty spendy to buy snowmachine parts and stuff.

The problem is developed, but it always falls back on the local people to take out these predators. cause and effect what happened with overall all the users. For them over there it's a necessity. They've got to have that caribou.

5 6 7

> 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

1 2

3

4

I hope that everything starts looking toward making sure the herds increase again because we have our use over there in our area for the caribou and we don't only use the meat. We use the skin and horns to make scrapers and everything. So it's become -- you know, it's a sad thing to see that we're losing something. It's something like what happened to the king salmon maybe. You get a lot of predators and it's hard for them to come back.

15 16 17

Thanks, Jack.

18 19

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Darrel. Any questions on the proposal to Lisa.

2.0 21 22

(No comments)

23 24

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. So Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments on the proposal.

25 26 27

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair. This is Lem Butler on the phone.

2.8 29

> CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Lem, go ahead.

30 31 32

33

34

35 36

37

MR. BUTLER: How you doing again. Assistant Director. This proposal obviously effects many herds, so I think that's why I was saddled with giving an initial recommendation. There may be some biologists who can give you more detailed technical information relative to the herds if we need to go there.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44 45

Our initial recommendation, which again is preliminary at this time, is to oppose this proposal. In large part it's because it's just so broad. It affects a lot of herds. In addition to the Western Arctic herd, the Teshekpuk and the Central Arctic Herd it actually has some overlap with the Porcupine Caribou Herd ranges as well, which I'll get into in a minute.

47 48

46

But each of these herds have different

biological considerations and concerns. Although we acknowledge three of those herds, the Western Arctic, Teshekpuk and Central Arctic have declined, again their status is a little different. We're seeing a lot of positive signs from the Western Arctic Herd that suggested it may be stabilizing. We're certainly not in the decline that we've seen that we would have brought to your attention five or more years ago.

Teshekpuk again declining, Central Arctic Herd took a large decline, but again we are seeing some positive signs there as well that may indicate that you won't see the same rapid decline that we suspect occurred going into the future. Of course the Porcupine Herd is stable. So again different considerations.

You know, a lot of the differences in seasons has to do with distribution, which I think the OSM analysis pointed out. Different people have access to the caribou at different times. When you take such a wide sweeping approach to again four herds over such a large area, it's easy to lose that local nuance and we think that's important to consider as you consider this proposal.

2.8

We do understand that diversion is a big concern for local users, the idea that people, outside hunters in particular and their airplanes, may be influencing the distribution of the caribou in the fall. So we certainly appreciate where this proposal comes from as well as the idea the cow harvest isn't --you know, generally when we're talking about decline in herds, we are also trying to minimize cow harvest, but as was noted it does put some burden on the resource user to distinguish between bulls and cows and that may lead to some law enforcement issues that are unintentional kind of consequences. Just mistakes that occur in the field when it comes to judging caribou that may put some resource users in a poor position.

We also note that the Board of Game has made recent changes to address a lot of these concerns relative to seasons and bag limits. There's probably going to be -- you know, it's probably hard to forecast how some of the changes will affect the number of hunters in the field, but I do think that the Board of Game has made some changes in some of these areas that will affect that, which I'm not going to say that

that's going to radically change the landscape by any means, but that may to some extent address some of the concerns about diversion if there are fewer hunters in the field.

So what we'd really encourage this Council to do is -- you know, as was also noted, we've gone through this period where we're changing the regs so quickly and we're trying to keep up with the conservation concerns, but it really does create a very dynamic landscape for the resource users. We'd really encourage trying to keep the regulations as stable as possible.

We've recently introduced a registration permit to try to capture harvest and quantify it better, assess the effects of human harvest on the population. Again, the Board of Game has made several changes to address conservation concerns, make the hunt more stable or make sure that the harvest is sustainable.

2.8

We think that holding the course for a period of time -- it seems like every time we go through a Federal Board of Game process or State Board of Game process someone changes it and we're constantly trying to align and make it easier for resource users. I don't know. I think a slow approach may be warranted before we make any big jumps.

The only other thing I have to add is that it was noted in our Department comments that while we are aligning Federal regulations in Units 21D, 24, 25A West and 26B with Western Arctic Herd regulations it's an area that primarily sees Central Arctic and Porcupine Caribou Herds in those areas. So again that's just that same caution. You know, it's a pretty broad brush, so you may be altering things unintentionally without getting that local kind of, you know, taking this piece by piece and looking at it at a finer level.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Lem.

Darrel, you've got a comment on

 his....

```
MR. VENT: Yeah, just one comment on
 1
 2
     that, you know. It's pretty critical that we get that
     limit number in there. It's just, you know, we've got
 3
 4
     everything in there pieced together when there's some
 5
     pretty vital information that we need to put in there.
     It's kind of hard to just go through all this and, you
 6
     know, like you said, you've got to put in there pieces
 7
     and getting that limit in there is what we're really
 8
 9
     kind of stressing toward right now.
10
11
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
     for the State.
12
13
14
                     (No comments)
15
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.
16
                                                       Thank
17
     you, Lem.
18
                                  Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19
                     MR. BUTLER:
2.0
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Gates of the Arctic
21
     Subsistence Resource Commission met on this proposal,
22
     but there was no conclusion, no recommendation.
23
     Koyukuk River Advisory did not meet on this proposal.
24
25
                     Were there any other advisory
26
27
     committees, Zach.
2.8
29
                     MR. STEVENSON: No, Mr. Chair.
30
31
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any written comments
32
     on this proposal.
33
34
                     MR. STEVENSON:
                                     No.
35
36
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Public testimony.
     Anybody on the phone care to comment.
37
38
39
                     (No comments)
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Regional Council
42
     recommendation. We'll take the proposal up in the
     positive. The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt
43
     proposal WP18-32.
44
45
                     MR. SIMON: So moved.
46
47
48
                     MR. GERVAIS: So moved. Second.
49
50
```

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock, seconded by Tim. Sort of an overview of the proposal. We submitted the formulation of this process at our spring meeting. The Board of Game was in session. We didn't know what the Board was going to do and I was concerned that there would be too much additional cow harvest opportunity. Fortunately the Board of Game made significant reductions in 26B, eliminating cow harvest entirely.

Yes, hunters have a problem distinguishing small bulls from cows and there were multiple cow caribou that were brought into wiseman by the protection that were taken away from hunters that shot cows that weren't supposed to be shooting them. They seize them and bring the meat in and give it away.

So fortunately that happened, but the basics of caribou are cow caribou lead migration and bull harvest in the fall occurs primarily in the tail end of those. I don't know if you've seen caribou migrate. It will be cow caribou out in front, there will be hundreds of caribou and the bulls drag in the back. In the fall, they're dragging in the back of those herds.

2.8

So the bull harvest does not affect where those caribou are going. Cows lead migration. The undercurrent is that all cows know where they're going to go. It's like, no, there's lead cows and they have an inner digital gland that's real dominant and they're specifically in cows that if you shoot them, you can cause the herd to move significantly. I've seen herds move over five, ten miles just from the lead cows getting shot.

 That happened big time in 2010 on the Ivashak River. Those guys went up there, they had a big cow caribou limit. July 1 they could shoot those lead cows. As soon as they showed up, we're going to kill cows. They'd shoot those lead cows. The caribou were moving all around. The air taxis told me some of the caribou went all the way back out to the coast and went all the way around to the Itkillik River. It completed deflected that movement. They went way to the east, they went into the head of the middle fork of the Chandalar.

Unit 25A is predominantly -- and too

bad Beth Lenart isn't here. 25A has had -predominantly west, has had predominantly Central Arctic Caribou. Porcupine Herd has rarely been coming into there. They only came in there about four years ago in any significant numbers, but not very many caribou have been utilized. 25A West from the middle fork of the Chandalar drainage to the west has predominantly been the primary wintering ground for the Central Arctic Herd.

9 10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

I think this proposal is, now, at this point, premature. We do not know that these herds are actually turning. We've had some early springs, but what the big downturn in these caribou herds was when we had the late spring of 2013. It annihilated the yearling component, it annihilated the calf production that year and it killed adult cows. It did produce calves. They died because they tried to lactate on -they didn't have any protein sources.

19 20 21

22

23

24

25

26

There was white snow right up until a few days before they were actually calving. They've got to have flowering grasses to finish that gestation. Tussock flowers, that's what they eat. So if they didn't have that, that killed a lot of caribou and the reproductive rates were fairly limited. That was shown especially in sheep.

27 2.8 29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36

So at this point I'm opposed to our proposal, but I still feel that the Boards need to understand caribou, that they only have one calf, when we've had this kind of declines. We've had Western Arctic Herd decline below 50 percent, to 60-70 percent. Central Arctic did the same thing. Teshekpuk is way down. If it was a moose population, you'd have zero cow moose harvest. Oh, these are just caribou, we'll just shoot them. It's like no. Caribou only have one calf. They never have twins.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

37

I want all of the regions and all of the people that look at this proposal to start thinking about caribou. That's what the Board did last spring. They were in this room. I came here and they had a yellow line on the floor over there and I caught six of seven Board members and I said read my RC, record copy, and I told them caribou only have one calf. I had four Board members tell me I didn't know they had one calf. I read your RC. I didn't know they had one calf. was surprised. I think that a political appointment

process of the Board of Game there needs to be a little more biological indoctrination.

So this proposal still has viability. Lisa went through a lot of work to make an analysis, but there's some misperceptions. In the fall, cows need protected. During the migration cows need to be protected because they lead the migrations. There's certain dominant cows. Cows are not real good until the first of October. You can kill cows in September, but they still are lactating fairly heavily and they're getting ready for the breeding season.

So there's no reason at all not to kill bulls all summer long, all the way -- you know, I don't care where they're at, whether they're on the summer range, winter range. Bulls are good from February 1 to the first of October. Tenth of October if you want to push it.

You're playing Russian Roulette by that

2.8

time.

Cows should never be harvested when they're in low population status before October 1 until early February. I'll disagree. I've killed bull caribou in December. Real skinny. They still are real thin. They've just come out of rut. They're only a month out of rut at that point, a month and a half. They're thin. And they're migrating when they're breeding, those Arctic Herds.

So the basics are we need to protect cows during migration and we need to protect cows when we have low population or recovering populations. We're not out of the woods yet. But I don't think we're going to get support for the proposal. I do want to have our conferencing with the other Regional Councils to talk about these issues. I want people to understand we need to conserve cows.

 If we had a moose population did this, there would be zero and there is zero cow moose harvest in Unit 24 right now for years. We have a propensity for a winter hunt down by Huslia, but we haven't had enough cows to support that.

So the bottom line is I want people to talk about conserving cow caribou. We want these herds

-- like I said previously, and I want the Department and our Staff to understand, the larger the herd the more they have -- they eat lichen, so those cows will keep expanding and there's untapped lichen resources. I've defied the Alaska Department of Fish and Game back in 2010 to do a lichen analysis and the migration analysis.

There's trails etched into the ground and you can see where caribou used to use. There's massive amounts of country in the south slope of the Brooks Range. The southwestern interior of Alaska and in the Forty Mile country north of the Yukon River massive amounts of country that caribou don't even use and they used to use it.

2.0

It's like they're not going to run out of food. They've got lots of country to move into. The bigger the herds, the more we'll feed. If we maintain large caribou populations, then we'll be able to feed a lot of people. They barrier themselves against predation.

 Deep snow, late springs and icing events. They don't just die arbitrarily. That's what's the trigger to start the decline of these caribou herds, then predation starts eating them up, overharvest of cows and overharvest of caribou can exacerbate things.

Western Arctic Herd crashed to 75,000. That's because there's no closed season and they could use them for dog feed. I was at Kobuk Village. They had stacks of caribou on the beach for dog feed. Stacks and the herd is in decline. They're using them for dog feed. When they closed caribou to the harvest for dog feed, the herd started rapidly recovering because they weren't using them as a food source for dogs.

 So I'm opposed to our proposal. I'm going to vote against the proposal so I don't exacerbate the pain, but I do want to talk about this proposal extensively on our conference call and hopefully the other Councils will come on board and talk about these caribou herd issues.

Any discussion from the Council on the proposal.

1 I got my big speech. 

Other Council members.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: Yeah, I think you said pretty much all that needs to be heard on this. Like I said, it's critical that we get these numbers in. We need to make sure that we put restrictions on them. We have to start working toward that. We need to find a way to do that in order to get -- whether it's putting in a proposal or getting everybody on board in order to get that numbers right.

2.0

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will state for the record I was happy with the Board of Game actions to start to make meaningful progress on recovering these caribou herds. So I'm happy the Board is moving in the right direction. This Board that we currently have has been working more rapidly towards caribou conservation and I'm happy about that.

Pollock.

2.8

MR. SIMON: I'll tell a little story here. In 1974, they pushed north to the Slope with the road. They put in the gravel road all the way to the North Slope and that was the last year that we get caribou around Allakaket for 10 years later. What happens is the road was built and they couldn't come into the Koyukuk River. There's travel on the road back and forth. The headlights scared them. Today they're migrating more to the west and coming around that way.

Later the State opened the haul road to public and the people go up and down the road. Then there's sport hunting allowed in some areas. Shooting from the road there and more of the caribou are moving to the west and making around. So I'm saying that road development will disrupt caribou migration route.

 Today the caribou are kind of piling up on the west coast. Some of them are kind of poor. They're eating too much in one area. The caribou used to come across the Koyukuk River into the Ray Mountains behind Allakaket. Temperate area, a lot of lichen and they were protected with trees and the hills. In

```
February and March the bulls come out with a lot of fat
 1
 2
     in the rump, but they don't come south anymore.
 3
                     Another thing is that wolves and
 4
 5
     grizzly bears kill a lot of these caribou. How to
     build up the caribou. We're being cut back on the take
 6
     of the caribou, yet the wolves are taking what we're
 7
     supposed to take and the grizzlies. Last year in
 8
     Anchorage at the annual meeting caribou group I told
 9
     them that the State and the Feds could do well by
10
     dispatching some wolves and grizzlies. They're the
11
     ones that's killing all the caribou, not the local
12
13
     people.
14
15
                     It's kind of tough years in the
     villages now with Feds and State cutting back funds on
16
17
     a lot of programs. More and more we need to feed
     ourselves and live off the country, yet there's no
18
     caribou out there for us to take. The caribou is not
19
2.0
     there, but we're still being cut back on the take.
21
22
                     I guess that's my comment.
23
24
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
26
27
                     Tim.
2.8
29
30
                     MR. GERVAIS:
                                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.
     When is the Federal Subsistence Board going to be
31
     deliberating these proposals?
32
33
                                           Sorry.
34
                     MS. MAAS:
                                In April.
                                                    Through
                 The meeting is in April for the Federal
35
     the Chair.
36
     Subsistence Board.
37
38
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Have they set a
     date?
39
40
                     MS. MAAS: I'm not aware of a date.
41
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Sometime in April.
44
45
                     MS. MAAS:
                                Sometime in April.
46
47
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's good
48
     enough.
49
50
```

MR. GERVAIS: So I was wondering if it would be possible to be able to have the caribou working groups go over a lot of these issues and then pass a modified version of this in our winter meeting or is that too late?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is the property of the Board. We can't really change the direction. That's kind of like a gyro or something. It's moving in a specific direction. Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just going to add that given the complexity and the number of caribou proposals, it would really throw a wrench in the timeline for the Board's process to have these Councils consider them again at their -- which is what would have to happen.

2.0

First, these working groups would have to be formed and agreed to by all the Councils. Then the working groups would have to meet and discuss. Then the Councils would have to meet and discuss them at their winter meetings to receive their working group recommendations. Many of these Councils are meeting until just a couple weeks before the Board meets. So it would be really impossible to process all that information and go through our process and get it ready for the Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't think that's possible. With the turn of the Board of Game's actions, the caribou themselves are stabilizing from health of the early springs and the certain specifics to the herds themselves, so the drive to pass this proposal isn't nearly as straight as it was last spring in February when we were meeting to develop this proposal.

Fred.

MR. ALEXIE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What I'd like to ask and I know Glenn Stout does a perfect job down in Galena area, like the predator, the wolves, the bear, what is that on the caribou percentage-wise? Anybody know?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There was data in here what those mortalities are.

MR. ALEXIE: I mean so we'd make a good decision.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's natural factors, but it's not like you're going to go and like shoot all the bears in the world and the whole northwestern portion of Alaska. That just can't happen. There's not enough money in the world to do that. The local harvest of wolves and bears is integral to helping sustain these populations, but asking for an IM project for these entire herds that can't really happen. It's too huge.

So, yeah, bears and wolves are a natural factor, but we're not talking about a few caribou being killed. We're talking about 12,000 caribou and a significant number of the Western Arctic Herd is cow caribou. Like I just said, if a moose population failed by two-thirds, there would be zero cow moose harvest.

2.8

So the kind of really large bag limits for cow caribou right now -- if we get a bad winter this year and the herd starts going down, we better start seriously dusting this proposal right back off again because this might actually be how we have to move. We're going into climate change, you get rain on snow, glazes of snow. Ask Jim Dau. It wipes caribou out.

You get late springs. There's things that happen.

These late springs come about every 10, 12 years. There's an oscillation to that. 1982, 1991, 2001, 2013, late springs. You see caribou populations decline off of those years. Those late springs are really hard on those animals. They've barely gotten through the winter and they have a high mortality of calves and the adults.

 So we're not out of the woods yet. Things are looking better. We don't have to pass this proposal now, but we might be seriously looking at this proposal if there's five feet of snow in the Brooks Range and the caribou population takes another big downturn. We get another 25-30 percent downturn we might be seriously thinking about cow caribou conservation. Like full on cow caribou conservation

period. No cow caribou harvest.

1 2 3

I mean the human population is larger and there's data here that we don't actually have. We have 12,000 caribou harvest. What's the wound loss rate? I've heard stories over there in the Kobuk River, bullets bouncing across, bullets flying all over the place shooting into those caribou and swimming herds. There's wounded caribou. There's no calculation of that mortality factor.

The Department doesn't like to talk about that, but it's a human-induced mortality. You've got high participation, 12,000 caribou harvested. If you add 20 percent, that's a significant number of caribou mortalities. So there's data lacks here. We don't have all the data.

2.0

Right now I'm opposed to this proposal because the herd is starting to stabilize and at this point we don't need to go rushing into something, but we need to start talking about what happens if it starts going down. We have to have local people start understanding we've got to start conserving some of these cows. We want to get this herd to turn around right away, you've got to conserve the cows. You can't just keep shooting them at all.

We've had enough discussion on that. One more comment. Anybody got a pressing issue? Jenny looks like she's got one.

MS. PELKOLA: Not really. As I was listening, you know, we've been discussing caribou for a long time and it sounds like a desperate move to save the caribou. I heard you say before that they had one calf, but it didn't really sink in until now how detrimental to our area or where the caribou migrate that would be if people really start killing them off. And it got me thinking about how to -- I think it made my decision on how I'm going to vote.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Jenny.

Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: We've had a lot of

discussion on this. It seems like we're still going around and around. Maybe we should just table this until the next meeting.

while.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. We have to vote it up or down. We can't table it because the next meeting is in the fall. The Federal Subsistence Board is going to act on the proposal in April. So we have to vote it up or down.

MR. THOMAS: No way to table it for a

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we could table it, but they'll vote however they feel.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  THOMAS: Well, we know it's going to have to come up again.....

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, it might have to come up again.

MR. THOMAS: ....and it would be a more advantageous time to do it, Jack.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It might come up again. Not necessarily. If we start going into a series of early springs and good production, the herds could come back even with the kind of harvest we have. But we're walking a fine line right now with the kind of cow caribou we have, harvest we have. The season is open for cows. I can kill a cow in 24.

I won't shoot one and I've talked to everybody in the village not to shoot a cow caribou. Somebody even talks about it and I jump down their throat. We don't have enough cows. I don't want to hear about that. I'm doing my part to conserve cows. Everybody's got to get it through their head. That's why we have to talk. These are not moose. These are caribou. We've got to conserve these cows.

But I don't think that this proposal will meet all of the criteria that the Federal Subsistence Board is going to look at. You know, if I'm hunting an animal and I decide I don't have a chance of killing that moose, the wind's not in my favor, it's on my back. The wind's not in our favor, it's on our back on this proposal, so I'm going to vote

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 10/10/2017 Page 107 against the proposal. 1 2 3 But if things keep going south, that's 4 why I want this working group to talk about this cow 5 caribou issue because if things turn the opposite direction, we might need to have everybody on board. 6 perceive we don't have enough momentum for this 7 8 proposal. 9 So that's the end of the comments. 10 11 Is somebody going to call the question. 12 13 14 MR. VENT: Question. 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is 16 17 called. Those in favor of Proposal WP18-32 signify by saying aye. 18 19 2.0 MR. GERVAIS: Aye. 21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the 22 proposal signify with the same sign. 23 24 25 IN UNISON: Aye. 26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We had one support 27 and the remainder opposed. Are you on the phone, 2.8 Shirley? Must be a big run on those four-wheelers with 29 30 that dividend coming in. 31 32 (Laughter) 33 34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I do really appreciate and you did an excellent job of drawing all 35 36 that information together for this analysis, Lisa. 37 Oh, I did not actually write 38 MS. MAAS: this analysis. 39 40 41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you didn't, 42 that's a good analysis. 43 44 MS. MAAS: But thank you. 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 46 There's a lot of

47

48

49 50 Tom Evans, another wildlife

information in there. Who did write this?

MS. MAAS:

biologist.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Cool. Yeah, a lot of good information there. We'll go for another proposal here.

MS. MAAS: All right. Next up is WP18-48/49. It might take you a little while to find it.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Everybody has found

 it.

Go ahead, Lisa.

MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, for the record, my name is Lisa Maas. We are discussing Wildlife Proposal 18-48/49.

2.0

WP18-48 was submitted by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group or WACH Working Group and WP18-49 was submitted by Louis Cusack of Chugiak. Both proposals request that Federal reporting requirements for caribou in Units 22, 23, and 26A be aligned with the State's registration permit requirements.

2.8

 Both proponents recognize the registration permit hunt as a useful tool to monitor harvest, inform herd management and provide more accurate harvest data, which is particularly important given the current WACH population decline. The proponent for 18-49 also states that different Federal and State reporting requirements would be very cumbersome and confusing to manage.

In 2016, the Alaska Board of Game adopted Proposal 40 to establish a registration permit hunt in Unit 22. In January 2017, the Board of Game adopted Proposal 2, requiring registration permits in Units 23 and 26 to better monitor harvest and improve management flexibility.

The proposals effects units within the ranges of the Western Arctic and Teshekpuk Caribou Herds. There's substantial uncertainties in local harvest estimates due to lack of harvest data and overlap between herds. Current harvest estimates accurately reflect trends, but not actual harvest numbers. This is particularly problematic during

periods of caribou population declines when harvestable surpluses may be exceeded.

If this proposal is adopted, State registration permits will be required to hunt caribou in Units 22, 23 and 26A. Requiring State registration permits would also reduce regulatory complexity and user confusion by aligning State and Federal reporting requirements. However, concurrence would be needed from the State to allow Federally qualified subsistence users to use a State registration permit while hunting under Federal regulations.

No biological impacts are expected from this proposal. Rather registration permits would provide better harvest data, benefitting the caribou resource and subsistence uses through more informed hard management and hunting regulations.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP18-48 and take no action on Proposal 18-49.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Lisa. Is the Council clear on what the proposal is?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have State of Alaska comments on the proposal, are you going to do this one, Lem.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair. We may have Phil Perry online who is the management coordinator of the Bethel office for what we call Region 5.

Phil, are you online?

MR. PERRY: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go right

MR. PERRY: Thank you for the opportunity here. My name is Phillip Perry. I'm the management coordinator for Region 5, which includes this portion of the state, Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.

ahead.

Our preliminary recommendation is to support this proposal. Like was stated earlier, it's pretty close to aligning the regulation between State and Federal. We spent a lot of time and effort with the registration permits, RC-800 and RC-907 to make sure they're available.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

1 2

3 4

5

We've had a lot of visits to communities in the region and we're really committed to making these work as a better tool for monitoring harvest. That's the purpose for those registration permits at this point. It kind of makes it easier for all the hunters, all the users to have Federal and State regulations that are as closely aligned as we can have.

15 16 17

Thanks.

18 19

2.0

21

22

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. question is how do you envision with these large bag limits supplying all of these? The registration permit is just -- you write a number in there or you've got an actual harvest ticket?

23 2.4 25

26

27

2.8

29 30

31

34

35 36

MR. PERRY: I wish I had a graphic to show you. Essentially these registration permits, where you guys would be familiar with a harvest ticket that you would punch out a date. So on that portion that you'd have to take in the field, instead of having a date it actually has spaces for recording the date of a harvest and then if it was a male or a female.

32 33

So it's not quite exactly like what people would think of a traditional harvest ticket. It's kind of a hybrid, but it's a way for people to better keep track of their harvest.

37 38 39

40

41

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They call those harvest reporting when you get a harvest fish permit. You just write in the date, how many you've got, et Something like that? And this report would be cetera. large enough to enumerate a lot of different caribou?

42 43 44

45

46

47

MR. PERRY: Yeah, that's correct. kind of the size of a harvest ticket, but instead of having all the language that's normally on a harvest ticket it has spaces for people to write down their harvest of caribou.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Yeah, I would like to see that at some point. Maybe you could have your staff email that to our coordinator here what that actually looks like.

Has our staff looked at this harvest

 report?

MS. MAAS: I have not seen an actual physical report, no.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to see that it's not onerous upon the user, that it's not a cumbersome thing to use in the field. I can see writing in. Each ticket would be relatively small. I know super-harvesters go out many days of the year. They might take caribou many, many different days. Under the Western Arctic sign-up they asked you how many caribou you killed in the spring and how many you killed in the fall. Sort of an overall number is what they used to send you, a questionnaire.

If the harvest ticket is date specific, then you'd have to have a lot of those for certain people if they are a super harvester. I talked to a guy in Selawik and he told me he killed 125 caribou a year. He killed them over many different days over spring and winter, fall time.

Any other questions on this harvest reporting system. It is good to have good data. I'm a proponent of getting good harvest data. It documents what the Boards are dealing with as far as harvest. It actually is a protection for the subsistence users to document what your harvests are because if they don't think you killed anything, they'll allocate that to somebody else. A sport user, somebody else. So it's good to have good harvest reporting.

Any other questions about the State's comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Thank

Any advisory committees comment on this, Zach, do you know of?

 you, Phil.

1 (On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've had a long

break.

Lisa is going to give us the next

proposal.

MS. MAAS: The next proposal is WP18-57. I think everyone has found it. Again, for the record, my name is Lisa Maas.

Again, some of the relevant background information such as herd biology and harvest has already been presented, so I'll just be presenting new information.

2.0

2.8

Wildlife Proposal WP18-57 was submitted by the North Slope Council and requests that Federal public lands in Units 26A and 26B be closed to caribou hunting by non-Federally qualified users. The proponent's intent of this proposal is to ensure local people get the caribou they need, protect declining caribou herds and reduce user conflicts.

In March 2017, the North Slope Council submitted temporary Special Action Request WSA17-04, which requested temporary closure of Units 26A and 26B to caribou hunting by non-Federally qualified users. The Board rejected this request in June 2017.

User conflicts occur most frequently near Anaktuvuk Pass in the Dalton Highway Corridor. Concerns center on herd deflection, migration disturbance and wanton waste by non-local hunters. One alternative considered was to close Federal public lands in Unit 26B; however, this is a relatively small area, it would likely be ineffective at reducing user conflicts and may concentrate use on State lands.

 If this proposal is adopted, Federal public lands would be closed to caribou hunting by non-Federally qualified subsistence users in Units 26A and 26B. Non-local harvest from Unit 26A is very small, only about 100 caribou per year. Closing Federal lands in Unit 26A may concentrate non-local hunters on State lands near Anaktuvuk Pass, thus increasing user conflicts.

While non-local hunters account for most of the caribou harvest in Unit 26B, much of this harvest occurs on State lands. Recent changes to State regulations in Unit 26B, including reducing harvest limits and eliminating cow harvest, are expected to be more effective in conservation of the Central Arctic Herd and decreasing hunting pressure from non-local hunters than a Federal lands closure.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{The}}$  OSM preliminary conclusion is to oppose Proposal WP18-57.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Lisa. Any questions on the proposal.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: Yeah, just a few questions here. Could we get the whole picture of what's going on in that area? I don't want to -- if we make a decision on this, I want to make sure that we have all the information. Is there a decline in the herd or is there too much overharvest or any of that information?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Lisa, go ahead.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, a lot of this information was already presented, so that's why I didn't present it again, but this came from the North Slope Council and is in response to both declining caribou herds, the Teshekpuk Herd, the Central Arctic Herd, and the Western Arctic Herd, and also user conflict. So it's concern over subsistence users meeting their needs, ensuring that they're able to harvest as much caribou as they need and also protecting the herds and reducing user conflicts.

 Again, all three caribou herds have declined substantially in the last several years although there are some indications that they may be stabilizing. Harvest of all these herds is either at the harvestable surplus or exceeding the harvestable surplus, although there's a lot of uncertainty surrounding those harvest estimates.

 $$\operatorname{\text{However}},$$  in 26A harvest from non-local residents is so small, it's only about 100 caribou out

of the whole unit and mostly Unit 26A is BLM lands. The small amount of State lands is kind of centered around Anaktuvuk Pass. So if you close Federal lands in Unit 26A, that might have the opposite effect of concentrating use on those State lands around Anaktuvuk It's one of the communities that really relies on caribou and has been hurting for several years and is concerned about meeting their needs.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14 15

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

In 26B it's a little different story where most of the caribou harvest is by non-Federally qualified users. However, there's still a lot of State lands in that area, so the effectiveness of closing the small percentage of Federal lands may not reduce harvest or conflicts but shift them around and concentrate them on State lands.

16 17 18

19 2.0

21

Again, a special action request was put in by the Council for last year and that was rejected by the Board for numerous reasons that I can enumerate if you're interested.

22 23 24

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead and give those Board reasons why they declined the special action request for 26A and B.

25 26 27

2.8

29

32 33

MS. MAAS: Sure. So the Board rejected 17-04 because, one, the relatively small cow harvest by non-Federally qualified users in 26A;

30 31

Two, the need for adequate time to determine if the recently-enacted conservation actions for the three caribou herds are effective in reducing caribou harvest or reversing the population decline;

34 35 36

37

Three, the closure of Federal public lands in Unit 26A would likely shift hunters to State lands around Anaktuvuk Pass;

38 39 40

41

42.

43

Four, closure of Federal public lands in Unit 26B, which makes up only about 30 percent of the unit, is not likely to have as much effect as recent Board of Game regulations to protect the Central Arctic Herd;

48

Five, a reduction in hunting pressure along the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area, which is thought to affect the migration of the Central Arctic Herd is unlikely to be effective as most non-

Federally qualified users will use the Dalton Highway Corridor to access adjacent State lands.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you.

Go ahead, Darrel.

MR. VENT: Just one more quick comment on that. You mentioned that there might be overharvest in the area. Is that one of the things that you guys are considering when you're looking at these bag limits here, whether on the State land or the Federal land?

MS. MAAS: Through the Chair. This proposal is just concerned about closure of Federal lands, not exactly harvest limits. Again, Unit 26A, the harvest is so low by non-Federal users that it's pretty much biologically insignificant. Wounding loss, as Jack has mentioned, is much higher than non-local harvest in Unit 26A. In Unit 26B there's so much State lands that it's thought -- it wouldn't really reduce harvest. It would just shift use to concentrate on State lands.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Josh.

2.8

MR. REAM: This is Josh Ream for the record. I just wanted to mention that during the tribal consultations for Special Action 17-04 wildlife, people from Point Lay also mentioned concerns about concentration of non-local users on State lands if this were to pass.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does that answer your questions, Darrel.

MR. VENT: I have one more, but I'll

wait.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

Don.

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Lisa, you mentioned some of the reasons for OSM opposing this. I guess the overriding factor would be the low take on Federal lands, the low take for this

hunt. Am I correct?

MS. MAAS: Through the Chair. That's correct for Unit 26A. This is for Unit 26A and 26B. The non-local harvest is so low it just wouldn't have much affect. But in Unit 26B most of the caribou are harvested by non-local users, about 89 percent, however there's not much Federal land in Unit 26B. And the Dalton Highway road access.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's not just road. A lot of the harvest occurs from air taxis that fly out of Deadhorse and Happy Valley and Galbraith Lake, so they can jump anywhere they want to. A lot of harvest in 26B occurs east and west of the road. There's a huge amount of State land in 26B. So the hunt demographic is a lot different in 26B than it was last year and through 2010. So 26B has a lot of harvest, but my feeling is that a majority of that harvest would occur on State land.

2.8

Any other questions on the proposal. It's basically to close non-subsistence uses on Federal lands. You should really have your reg book out and look on Page 127. It shows the map and the unit boundaries and the white areas are State lands. So if you close the Federal lands, people just have to go a little ways and they're right on State lands. You're not eliminating hunters, you're just concentrating them in certain areas.

This is not going to do what people think it's going to do.

Any other questions on the proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll go to the State of Alaska. Lem, are you on the phone?

MR. BUTLER: I am, Mr. Chair. Thank you. The State would agree with the OSM analysis and what the Chair has summarized. Our preliminary recommendation, although we reserve the right to change it of course, is to oppose the proposal. There's a lack of biological evidence this would really make a large difference. It looks like the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd is showing signs of being stable, possibly even

increasing. We don't think that the Central Arctic Herd will continue to decline at the rate it has. We saw a lot of adult mortality and some emigration of the herds that we think precipitated the recent decline. We have reason to suspect that's going to change.

As has been noted, this affects 26A and 26B. A lot of the Western Arctic Herd is moving to the south at this point in time when the non-local hunters show up. Much of the harvest pressure actually occurs in Unit 23 to the south of 26A. It's somewhat logistically hard to get to. So really the implications of this proposal are probably for the eastern portion of what's effected, which is perhaps eastern 26A, but 26B.

As has been noted again, just reiterating what's already been said, the Board of Game has taken action to adjust caribou bag limits and try to regulate harvest as best possible in that area. We've also made a few adjustments to the regulations that are in place apply to the herds that most often occur in areas.

2.8

So we'd really encourage you to wait and see what effect the recent regulatory changes have on the conservation of these herds. Again, to some extent, regulatory stability. We keep changing all these things, so trying to slow down the changes and see what effects the current changes have. A lot of these changes haven't even been implemented yet or we haven't had a chance to assess the effects of what's been done.

It's really difficult when it's an ever-moving landscape. The variables keep changing to associate any positive or negative effect with any change. I think from a managerial point of view trying to provide a little stability both so people can assess whether the changes have a positive or negative effect as well as making it easier for resource users to follow the changes would be beneficial.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Lem. Any questions for Lem Butler.

(No comments)

Page 119 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. 2 Federal input on this proposal. 3 4 BLM is a major landholder in Units 26A 5 and B. 6 7 Erin. 8 9 MS. JULIANUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Erin Julianus, wildlife biologist for 10 the BLM Central Yukon Field Office, and we oppose this 11 proposal for essentially the reasons that Lisa stated. 12 13 14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. 15 Have North Slope met on this or not? 16 17 MS. MAAS: No. 18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Subsistence 19 2.0 Resource Commission did talk about proposals. Gates of the Arctic did not address that proposal that 21 I see in our comments. I don't recall discussing that 22 one or taking a position. 23 24 25 MR. VENT: Mr. Chair. 26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Darrel. 27 2.8 29 MR. VENT: This proposal is concerning 30 an area that I think is not in the Western.... 31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have customary 32 33 and traditional use determinations of those, so that's why these cross-regional jurisdictions apply to 34 different Councils. 35 36 MR. VENT: So we're making an action on 37 areas that's influencing our areas. 38 39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. 40 Or people 41 that live in our region. 42 43 MR. VENT: Just as long as it doesn't 44 conflict with the areas that's in the Northwest Arctic. 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Now we've 46 47 gone through the agencies. Regional Council recommendation. The Chair will entertain a motion to 48 adopt Proposal WP18-57 to get it on the table. Do we 49 50

Page 120 have a motion to adopt. 1 2 3 MR. VENT: Make a motion. 4 5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to adopt by 6 Darrel. 7 8 MS. PELKOLA: Second. 9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny. 10 Discussion on the proposal. As I stated, I was very 11 pleased with the Board of Game's..... 12 13 14 MR. STEVENSON: Pardon me, Mr. Chair. 15 CHATRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead. 16 17 MR. STEVENSON: You could check if 18 there's anybody on the phone who wishes to speak. 19 20 21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, excuse me. 22 Is anybody on the phone to speak to the 23 proposal or in the room. 24 25 (No comments) 26 27 Okay. CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. 2.8 for bringing me back on track there, Zach. As I said, 29 30 the Board of Game took action on Unit 26B, significantly reduced the harvest opportunity to bulls 31 only and reduced the bag limit significantly from five 32 33 to two bulls for residents and one for non-resident. 34 I feel with that current bag limit that 35 36 the harvestable surplus will not be exceeded by the non-subsistence users because this year especially the 37 caribou weren't available near the road and the harvest 38 was fairly low and the weather was really bad on the 39 North Slope. 40 41 Under 815 of ANILCA, there cannot be a 42 significant or elimination of non-subsistence uses if 43 there's a harvestable surplus that is sustained by the 44 45 subsistence users and for others. Passing this proposal would actually be in violation of ANILCA 46 47 statute because subsistence is a priority, it's not an exclusive use. Right now the harvestable surplus in 48 26A and 26B is sufficient to provide for subsistence 49 50

and other users. 1 2 So with the Board of Game's actions to 3 stay within sustained yield, I feel that the Board's 4 5 actions will be sufficient to at least stabilize the harvest to the point where these -- if they hadn't 6 taken any action, then I would have been supportive of 7 the proposal for 26B, but I don't want to slap down the 8 9 Board of Game because they did the right thing. 10 11 So I'm in opposition to Proposal WP18-57 myself. 12 13 14 Any further comments or discussion on 15 the proposal Council Members. 16 17 (No comments) 18 19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Calling question. 20 Call the question. 21 MR. VENT: 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question on the 23 24 proposal. Those in favor of WP18-57 signify by saying 25 aye. 26 27 (No aye votes) 2.8 29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same 30 sign. 31 32 IN UNISON: Aye. 33 34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal fails. 35 36 Lisa. 37 MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Next 38 we're going to Proposal 46/47. It looks like people 39 have found that one. Again, for the record, my name is 40 Lisa Maas and next up is Wildlife Proposal 18-46/47. 41 42 43 Wildlife Proposal 18-46 was submitted by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group or 44 45 WACH Working Group, and Wildlife Proposal 18-47 was submitted by Enoch Mitchell of Noatak. Both proposals 46 request that Federal public lands in Unit 23 be closed 47 to caribou hunting except by Federally qualified 48

49 50

subsistence users, although WP18-47 specifically

requests that the closure extend from 2018 to 2020/21 only.

Both proponents are concerned about the decline of the Western Arctic Herd and noted that the 2016/17 closure to non-Federally qualified users helped local hunters meet their subsistence needs by reducing user conflicts and hunting activity from non-local hunters. Both proponents also emphasized the vital cultural and nutritional role of caribou to Unit 23 residents.

 The proponent for WP18-47 also stated that aircraft noise from transporters and guides can disrupt caribou migration, which is a source of user conflict. Co-sponsors for WP18-47 include the Native Village of Noatak, the Cape Krusenstern National Monument Subsistence Resource Commission, the Kobuk Valley National Park Subsistence Resource Commission, and the Noatak/Kivalina Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

2.8

In 2016, the Board adopted Wildlife Special Action 16-01 closing all Federal public lands in Unit 23 to caribou hunting by non-Federally qualified users for the 2016-17 regulatory year. In June 2016, the State submitted temporary Special Action Request WSA-16-03 to reopen Federal public lands in Unit 23. The Board rejected this request.

In June 2017, the Board adopted Wildlife Special Action 17-03, closing a portion of Federal public lands in Unit 23 to caribou hunting by non-Federally qualified users for the 2017-18 regulatory year. This targeted closure included Federal public lands along the Noatak River and within the Squirrel, Eli and Aggie River drainages.

 On average, local hunters within the range of the WACH account for 95 percent of the total Western Arctic Herd harvest while non-local hunters account for 5 percent. Most Western Arctic Caribou are harvested in Unit 23.

In 2016, during the Federal lands closure, the number of non-Federally qualified hunters in Unit 23 decreased substantially. Most local hunters access caribou hunting areas by boat, while most non-local hunters access hunting areas by plane.

User conflicts between local and non-local hunters have been well documented in Unit 23 since at least the 1980s, particularly in Noatak National Preserve and the Squirrel River drainage. Local hunters have expressed concerns over aircraft and non-local hunters disrupting caribou migration by scaring caribou away from river crossings, landing and camping along migration routes and shooting lead caribou.

Other sources indicate that while aircraft can affect caribou behavior in the short term, they likely do not impact long-term caribou behavior or migration through Noatak National Preserve. Short-term disturbance could still affect hunter success.

The Unit 23 interagency group was established in January 2017 when the Board directed the Office of Subsistence Management to organize a group of State and Federal representatives in order to discuss possible solutions to Unit 23 user conflicts such as targeted closures. This group met in April of 2017 and agreed upon a possible targeted closure.

2.8

User conflicts occur more frequently in some areas of Unit 23 than in others. Specifically portions of Noatak National Preserve and the Squirrel River Drainage have repeatedly been identified at Regional Advisory Council and public meetings as areas where conflicts are concentrated. Conversely, other Federal public lands in Unit 23, such as Bering Land Bridge National Preserve, Selawik National Wildlife Refuge and Gates of the Arctic National Preserve have not been identified as areas experiencing much user conflict.

 Due to this discrepancy in user conflict, a partial Federal public lands closure as depicted in Map 10 on Page 49 may be more appropriate and more effective than a unit-wide Federal lands closure. Indeed, a unit-wide closure may represent an unnecessary restriction on non-subsistence uses. The targeted closure depicted in Map 10 on Page 49 is also the area suggested by the Unit 23 interagency group.

If this proposal is adopted, caribou hunting on Federal public lands in Unit 23 would be closed to non-Federally qualified users. Regulatory year 2018/19 would be the third consecutive year of a

closure. No biological impact is expected from adopting this proposal as non-Federally qualified users account for such a small percentage of Western Arctic Herd harvest.

While the number of non-Federally qualified users and aircraft in Unit 23 would likely decrease substantially, use may become concentrated on State lands, particularly on gravel bars below the mean high water mark. Other users, such as moose hunters, private planes and recreational boaters would still be able to fly over and access Federal public lands.

Subsistence opportunity for Federally qualified subsistence users may increase. Local residents recognize positive effects from the 2016-17 closure, citing higher harvest success. The WACH Working Group developed guidelines for herd management, which can be found on Table 1 on Page 22 of the analysis.

Currently the Western Arctic Herd population is on the line between preservative and conservative management. One recommendation under preservative management is closure of some Federal public lands to non-qualified users. These guidelines were developed and agreed upon by many stakeholders, including the Federal Subsistence Board.

Two criteria for restricting non-subsistence use under Title VIII of ANILCA are conservation of healthy wildlife populations and continuation of subsistence uses. Closure for conservation reasons is not warranted. However, closure of some Federal public lands for the continuation of subsistence uses is warranted due to continued user conflicts in the Noatak and Squirrel River Drainages as well as the benefit of the 2016-17 closure.

As I'm reading the OSM preliminary conclusion, it may help to refer to Map 10 on Page 49. The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP18-46 with modification to close all Federal public lands within a 10 mile wide corridor (5 miles either side) along the Noatak River from the western boundary of Noatak National Preserve upstream to the confluence with the Cutler River; north of the Noatak River between, and including, the Kelly and Nimiuktuk River

drainages; within the northern and southern boundaries of the Eli and Aggie River drainages, respectively; and within the Squirrel River drainage to caribou hunting except by Federally qualified subsistence users and to take no action on Proposal WP18-47.

5 6 7

1 2

3

4

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 9

10

Thank you, Lisa. CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: OSM's preliminary conclusion with the delineated closure area.

11 12 13

Is that clear to the Council.

14 15

Go ahead, Darrel.

16 17

18 19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. VENT: Just some clarification I'm looking at Page 45 and you're talking about not closing the aircraft on Federally qualified areas. So if we have subsistence users, which means that everybody is a subsistence user. But if you're using aircraft, you have transporters coming in. something that you'd be worried about? Because the villagers would have to walk quite a ways in just to get to where the hunting areas are along the river compared to using an aircraft where it would be more easily accessible. I'm just kind of confused on that.

27 2.8 29

30

31 32

33

34

35 36

37

MS. MAAS: Through the Chair. So this is -- Figure 12 on Page 45 is depicting all aircraft use in Noatak National Preserve and the OSM preliminary conclusion is recommending closing portions of Noatak National Preserve for the continuation of subsistence use because that is an area that's continually cited as user conflicts and one of the main reasons are all those aircraft and all the transporters flying over and landing, camping along migration routes scaring caribou, things like that.

38 39 40

Does that answer your question?

41 42 43

44 45

46 47

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you see the map on 49 here. All that crosshatch would be open to subsistence, but it would not be open to nonsubsistence users for caribou. She made it clear that it could be open for bear hunters or moose hunters or other kinds of hunters. Only caribou would be closed under this proposal.

48 49

So she explained to me that MR. VENT: 2 there would be no aircraft flying into these areas. 3 4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They could fly in 5 with aircraft to hunt bears, moose..... 6 7 MR. VENT: But not caribou. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But not caribou. 10 That's what I need to know. 11 MR. VENT: 12 13 MS. MAAS: And the majority of hunters in that area are caribou hunters. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But theoretically a 16 17 subsistence user in Kotzebue could fly to that area and hunt. 18 19 20 MS. MAAS: That's correct. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions. 23 (No comments) 24 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Lisa. 26 27 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 2.8 Lem. 29 30 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 31 believe we have Phil Perry on the line. Phil, would 32 33 you like to address this one or would you like me too? 34 35 MR. PERRY: This is Phillip. 36 can take it, Lem. So our preliminary recommendation here is to oppose this proposal. I think some of our 37 thoughts are along the same lines as the OSM analysis. 38 This is probably not going to change the harvest much 39 or the biology. Again, there were several changes the 40 Board of Game did last January for Unit 23. One is 41 putting in the registration permit so we can get a 42 better certainly of harvest. 43 44 45 The other thing was there was an extension of the Noatak Controlled Use Area that the 46 Board did with a lot of input from the communities 47 there to see if -- the Board of Game looked at it very 48 carefully trying to balance the -- you know, help the 49 50

communities with any user conflict, but not close such a broad area that it completely removes any non-resident or non-local hunting.

So with those changes I think we'd prefer to not have this pass and have a year or two of these regulations to evaluate how they've affected hunting and different hunters there.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.
Thanks, Phil. Federal comments. Do we have anybody from Park Service for Noatak Preserve.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't see anybody.

BLM comments.

2.4

Bruce.

2.8

MR. SEPPI: Mr. Chair. For the record, Bruce Seppi with Anchorage Field Office BLM. We would oppose the original proposal as written, but would support OSM's modified version of 46 where there was targeted closures of Federal lands.

I should point out that the Squirrel River is mostly BLM up away from the river, but there are selected lands which are State lands right in that river corridor. If that's closed, which we would support, hunters could still land in that gravel bar area and hunt in that gravel bar area and take caribou in that corridor. So it isn't as though it's just completely shutting it down.

 In the guides and outfitters and transporters, the few that we permit there, closing these areas pretty much shut down the Squirrel River for caribou hunting, but there are still moose and bear hunters that are in there that are generally transported in there and left with guides and then transported out.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

MR. STEVENSON: To add onto Lisa's point, the comments that were submitted -- I should clarify, that were submitted by those three National Park Service Subsistence Resource Commissions more or less articulated the same points. That they viewed caribou as a vitally important resource of interest to Federally qualified subsistence users and their perception was that this would help to minimize those user conflicts.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2.0

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. So the Chair will entertain a motion to support OSM's preliminary conclusion that supports Proposal WP18-46 with modification and take no action on 18-47 and then delineates this area in the Noatak Preserve, which some of that delineation is in the Board of Game's Controlled Use Area also. So some of that is addressed by the Board, but not the user types.

So the Chair is entertaining a motion to adopt OSM's preliminary conclusion with the defined closure area in Unit 23. You can see that on Page 3 and 4 of this proposal.

MR. GERVAIS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So moved.

MR. SIMON: Second.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded by Pollock. Discussion on the proposal.

Go ahead there, Darrel.

MR. VENT: As I mentioned before, this is our areas that are in the Northwest, so we're making recommendations on there without their input. I'm just pointing that out.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, they haven't met yet and we have to meet now and make decisions. Basically it's their proposal. OSM has kind of trimmed it back a little with, which BLM will now support the modified proposal whereas they wouldn't have before.

1 Carl, do you have something to say.

MR. JOHNSON: Sure, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to express to Darrel think of this not as discussing a proposal that's in somebody else's region, but you speaking on behalf of subsistence users in your own region that use that resource and hopefully that will make you feel more comfortable about making a recommendation to the Board.

MR. VENT: Yeah. I just didn't want to look at it as we're making a conflict with them. We like to work with them because they have a good board over there just as we do.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I kind of was confused about this because I don't know if we consider this a cross-over proposal or not. I mean because none of our region affects this. I don't mind supporting another region's proposal, but I don't know why this is in ours when it's not a cross one.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The reason being is that Unit 23 -- a customary and traditional use determination is residents of Unit 21D West of the Koyukuk River and Yukon River Drainages, Galena, including Wiseman and other residents of the Dalton Highway Corridor in Unit 26A. There's a whole bunch of residents in Unit 24 that have customary and traditional use, including Darrel, who is talking about going over there to Selawik to shoot caribou.

So this proposal directly affects this region because we have customary and traditional use. If caribou are protected there and they migrate past more effectively through the harvest area of Unit 23, they may actually get over there into the Huslia Flats by Darrel or hopefully they'll come over by me.

MR. HONEA: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're on the discussion of the proposal.

You've got one more comment there,

135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Carl.

```
MR. JOHNSON:
                                  Mr. Chair, thank you.
 1
 2
     Just a follow-up again on the last thing that Darrel
     had indicated about how the Northwest Arctic Council
 3
     might feel about this Council's action. Based on some
 4
 5
     of our off-season discussions with members of that
     Council, it seems like there might be support on that
 6
     Council also for OSM's preliminary conclusion.
 7
     have to wait and see what the ultimate discussion is,
 8
 9
     but some of our discussions with some of those Council
     members seem to be going in that direction.
10
11
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
12
                                               Glad to hear
13
     that. And they were part of the Board of Game's
     discussion on the Controlled Use Area expansion.
14
     yeah, I don't feel out of line by going with OSM's
15
     preliminary conclusion of delineation of the closure.
16
17
                     Other Council Member comments.
18
19
20
                     (No comments)
21
                     MR. ALEXIE: Call for question.
22
23
2.4
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question on the
25
     main motion is to adopt the OSM preliminary conclusion
     to support Proposal WP18-46 with modification to
26
     delineate the closure area. Those in favor of that
27
     proposal signify by saying aye.
2.8
29
30
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
31
32
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Opposed, same sign.
33
34
                     (No opposing votes)
35
36
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Modified proposal
     18-46 is adopted.
37
38
                     Lisa.
39
40
                     MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41
42
     last caribou proposal is 18-45, the next proposal.
43
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
44
                                         Zach was wanting
45
     clarification.
                     No action on Proposal WP18-47 and that
     was understood under the modification so I want the
46
47
     record to reflect that.
48
                     Go ahead, Lisa.
49
50
```

MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, for the record, my name is Lisa Maas.

The last of the caribou proposals is WP18-45. Wildlife Proposal 18-45 was submitted by the Northwest Arctic Council and requests that the caribou harvest limit in Unit 23 be reduced from 5 caribou per day to 3 caribou per day.

The proponent states that the proposed change is needed to conserve the Western Arctic Caribou Herd as its population is currently declining and is a vital subsistence resource. The proponent also notes that the proposed change will still meet the needs of Federally qualified subsistence users.

In 2016 the Federal caribou harvest limit in Unit 23 was reduced from 15 caribou per day to five caribou per day. One alternative considered was to defer this proposal. However, unless the Board of Game reduces the State harvest limit, this proposal would have no conservation effect and would result in Federal regulations being more restrictive than State regulations.

2.8

If this proposal is adopted, the caribou harvest limit in Unit 23 would be reduced, which reduces opportunity for Federally qualified subsistence users. Federal regulations would also be more restrictive than State regulations, eliminating a subsistence priority. State and Federal regulations would be further misaligned, increasing regulatory complexity and user confusion.

In 2016, the harvest limit was reduced from 15 caribou per day to five caribou per day. Time is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of recent regulatory restrictions before enacting further restrictions. There would also be no conservation effects from adopting this proposal as all Alaska residents would still be able to harvest five caribou per day in Unit 23 under State regulations except in areas that are closed to these users.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{The}}$  OSM preliminary conclusion is to oppose WP18-45.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Lisa. Any questions on the proposal.}$ 

Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: Supposedly we're worried about the condition of the herd and how many, now we're trying to cut it and we're opposed to it?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Northwest Arctic is concerned about the bag limit being that high and that is a fairly high bag limit, but....

MR. THOMAS: Five is very high or 15,

what?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, five caribou bag limit per day, every day.

MR. THOMAS: Yeah, I know.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Especially if they're killing cows. But the effect of the proposal — there's still five caribou bag limit on the State lands and other areas that are not closed to non-subsistence users. So basically the proposal is too weak. They'd have to get the Board of Game to reduce the bag limit to three to be effective. So they should make an out-of-cycle proposal to the Board of Game to do that. So that would be the first step.

MR. THOMAS: So you're saying that both entities should cut it down to this or forget it.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the Board of Game would -- their regulation right now allows five caribou per day. This is just another one of these kind of proposals that the Council should talk this over and then submit an agenda change request to the Board of Game to change the bag limit to three. A redundant proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board would be an effective management reduction.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: Well, it sounds like this proposal is between OSM and Northwest. I think that maybe we shouldn't take any action on this. This is not our proposal. This is not in our area. It's

concerning them.

1 2 3

I'd let them make a decision on it.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Your recommendation is deferral? Well, let's continue through the process here.

Let's go to the State, Lem or Phil.

MR. PERRY: Mr. Chairman, this is Phillip. I'm still here.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You have comments on Proposal WP18-45.

MR. PERRY: Yeah. So I think our thinking is very similar. We don't want to have a different Federal regulation than State, especially one that would probably not change many things. We'd like to also point out the reason there's a five caribou per day bag limit, we don't think at this point that harvest is what's driving this population one way or the other.

2.8

Again, we have a brand-new registration permit that's in place to help us with getting better harvest reporting. A change from five to three we don't really think that would be a change as far as the number of caribou harvested. Five gives people, especially local hunters that depend on caribou, the flexibility to harvest caribou when they're abundant. Three per day would potentially make people travel back and forth more or not be as efficient in their harvesting of caribou.

We at least preliminary oppose this kind of on those grounds that it's not really going to make a lot of difference in harvest, but it may affect how people harvest caribou.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Your comment that you don't think that harvest is a driving factor. A 12,000 caribou harvest, what is your calculated incidental harvest mortality? What's your wound loss factor? Is that actually even calculated into this mortality factor?

MR. PERRY: Yeah, I'm not aware of

anywhere we calculate that. I'd have to defer to maybe Lem or somebody would know off the top of their head if there's other areas we use a wounding loss factor in, but we don't in this area.

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 2

3

4

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You've heard these stories about these caribou swimming across the river and all the shooting and bullets bouncing off the water and hitting other boats and stuff. You didn't think that there's a wound loss rate at all? There's got to be some kind of a factor. That's not real science if you don't actually have kind of an idea what -- when you've got 12,000 harvest, there could easily be a 20 percent mortality factor with bullets bouncing around like that in herds.

14 15 16

> MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair, this is Lem.

17 18 19

22

23

24

25

26

27

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

20 21

MR. BUTLER: As Phil indicated, wounding loss is a really difficult thing to quantify. There have been studies that have been done on elk and other species. It usually takes a very close inspection with telemetry and other things to try to quantify it. There are carcass assessments and things like that. Generally those studies are fairly expensive and imprecise and still don't completely quantify exactly what the wounding loss is.

29 30 31

32 33

34

35

Generally what we do is we apply to most of our herds a loss factor and that might incorporate both legal harvest or unreported harvest as ell as wounding loss in our herds. You're right in asserting that it's a relative quantification when we apply those things, but we do try to account for it.

36 37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

The other thing that I'd point out is that there are a lot of factors that affect caribou survival through the course of the year that we are not able to quantify. Loss to predation, whether it be bears or wolves or starvation, drowning, other natural events. We've seen landslides and avalanches that have taken out up to 100, 200, 300 caribou at a time. are a lot of things that are very difficult to quantify.

46 47 48

What we attempt to do is we attempt to quantify the human contribution to mortality on an

annual basis and assess whether humans are driving a population or not. A lot of those things that we can't quantify, like wounding loss, I suggest get caught in other things indirectly. We can't subscribe it 100 percent, but it will show up in our adult mortality associated with radio collars.

1 2

3 4

5

Again, we might not be able to distinguish between human wounding loss and predation and other natural events, but it's not that we don't do the best we can with the information provided.

11 12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 2.0

21

24

25

26

27

2.8

29 30

31

34

35

10

Generally what you're going to see from the Department is that as the population changes and responds to changes in regulations, we'll make those adjustments. So if a season is liberalized and the population takes an erratic turn, whether it's a decrease or if it seems to handle it, we're going to assume that that component of wounding loss, which probably varies annually, is either sustainable or not and make the adjustments accordingly.

22 23

I understand that that's a concern. Ιt definitely is for a species that tends to aggregate particularly in the winter. You may have pass-through shots, you may have other situations where they go up the hill and you can't capture the animal or reduce it to a useable kind of thing. But we are doing the best we can with that. I do think that although it's not directly measured we're picking up on it and trying to respond to it accordingly.

32 33

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My point is that when we're approaching maximum harvest, that these nuances can be a driving factor in whether this herd is going to recover very quickly.

36 37 38

MR. BUTLER: And I'd agree with you on that.

39 40 41

42

43

44 45

46 47

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Like I was at a Board of Game meeting and they were talking about the bison harvest at Delta and how they needed to spread the harvest out because there was an exponent of the more competition the more riskier shots hunters take and the more riskier shots taken were more higher incidental harvest mortalities, so the Board was addressing that through a deliberation process.

As these caribou herds get lower in number and people get more competitive, I think that there should be -- all managers should be thinking more closely about what is that correction factor. Is it 3,000 animals, 1,000 animals. If the herd drops below we go into preservative, that should be a driving question in further deliberations, but we're not there yet.

8 9 10

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chair.

11 12

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Dennis. Question to the State.

13 14 15

16 17

18

19 2.0

21

MR. THOMAS: Okay. Well, the questions that we've got here, all these driving factors that we put in, this is kind of an act of God, a lot of this. You say your wound factor. This happens. This is part of the thing. Getting hit by a landslide, this is an act of God again. These are the kinds of things that we can't really control. All we could do is have some numbers coming in behind it.

22 23 24

25

26

27

2.8

29 30

31

But from here, if we go from five caribou a day to three, that's 40 percent that we've saved right there. They're still living for that herd to grow. So what the heck is wrong with that? other factors are going to be in there, but this kind of thing we can do something about now. You want to build that herd up, okay, cut down your take on it. me this is a good way to start. You're saving 40 percent right there and that's my comment.

32 33 34

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don.

35 36 37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44 45

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair, I also have to agree with this. This is the one like the one from the GASH area where they knocked out where they want to take off 10 days. What am I missing here? If the Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council wanted to reduce their take, then what am I missing here? Why is OSM opposed to this? I mean what is the rationing here? What is the justification for doing that? Isn't that kind of like -- not a cost-saving thing, but something like you're saving your wildlife? What am I missing?

46 47 48

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Lisa, do you have a

49

50

comment.

MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So if WP18-46 is passed, which is the closure, OSM recommended a targeted closure to continue subsistence use because people from Noatak are having trouble meeting their needs and we have listened to many people at public hearings talk about how expensive and time-consuming it is to harvest caribou that they cannot afford to come home empty-boated.

So if we enact this closure to help them harvest caribou, but then we reduce the harvest limit and the only place in Unit 23 where that reduction in harvest limit actually has an effect is in that closed area, that just doesn't make sense to me that we're saying we're going to close this area to help Noatak residents harvest caribou but we're going to reduce the harvest limit so it's going to take you longer and you might have to travel further and spend more money to find caribou because you can only harvest three per day instead of five per day, but all the non-local hunters on State lands can still harvest five per day.

So I don't know if that helps answer your questions or that makes sense, but then Federal users would be more restricted than the non-local users.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But another aspect is a lot of caribou are harvested in the Kobuk when they're swimming. Well, that's State waters. When they're swimming in the river, they shoot them in the water, they can shoot five a day. That's a five caribou limit. There could be Federal lands on both sides. That still doesn't stop them from shooting five caribou.

So this proposal has flaws in it that it needs to have State regulation. That's one of the issues with this proposal. It has the flaw that there's a five caribou bag limit under State regulations and a lot of caribou are killed in the river.

Go ahead.

MR. THOMAS: What would be the matter with the State going down to this then too so we're equal across the board? Is this so hard to do or to

recommend or whatnot?

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If the Councils get together and have a call, we could talk about all four Councils submitting an agenda change request to the Board of Game to reduce the bag limit to three. Then, if the Board adopts that, then we could easily get the Federal Board then we'd have a uniform regulation. But this proposal is not -- what Lisa's saying is it's not going to work right now because the way the -- the Northwest Arctic feels that the caribou herd can't support five caribou a day bag limit. They think there's some problem.

Zach is their council coordinator. What was the underlying discussion there, Zach?

2.0

MR. STEVENSON: Through the Chair. Responding to the points that were made both by Member Honea and Member Thomas. At the previous meeting there was a concern that the amount of harvest that was occurring and the majority of the take is coming from local residents themselves. If the Northwest Arctic Herd continued to decline, that those Federally qualified users would shoulder some of that responsibility and also some of those effects.

One of the Council Member Hannah Loon introduced a motion to reduce some of that take and that was ultimately supported by the Council. So that was the rationale why that came forward. It was, from my perspective, an expression of the Council's attempt to try to enact some conservation of that subsistence resource that the Council viewed as being important to their members.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's exactly what I wanted to hear what their line of rationale was.

Go ahead, Darrel.

MR. VENT: That was the reason that I suggested that we take no action on this because they made a decision. It's up to them. OSM made their decision. So why should we be taking action on something that's conflicting between them and OSM and the State?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think this is a worthy discussion issue, but I don't think this proposal is viable because it has flaws in it. could table the discussion or defer the proposal to the region to Northwest Arctic and let them fight with the Federal Subsistence Board on what their wishes are, but I would like them to also be able to have a discussion with them why this proposal wasn't viable. That's why I'm wanting this work group so all of our Councils can talk about what will work and what won't work. Yeah, I understand what they want and I would be supportive of that.

12 13 14

15

16

1 2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

I would entertain deferring the proposal myself. I do want to talk about this. think that the idea is viable, but it needs to be approached to the Board of Game.

17 18 19

2.0

21

22

23

24

I would think that we MR. THOMAS: would want to support what they want to do. If this is what they want, I'd say go to the Council that's involved with this and we should want to support what they want. Unless it would really be detrimental to anything we got, then we'd say, hey, guys. overall, I think we would want to support each other.

25 26 27

2.8

29

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's a non-viable regulation because they can kill five caribou a day on the river. So it's a non-viable regulation.

30 31

MR. THOMAS: You say it's non-viable, Jack. Maybe it is viable. Maybe there's some way it could work, see.

33 34 35

32

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Carl.

36 37 38

39

40

41

42

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll interject one of the things that we hope to try to remind our Councils of is that is when the Federal Subsistence Board hears your recommendation, there are three parts of Section 805(c) of ANILCA they'll be looking at to determine whether or not they're going to accept your recommendation.

43 44 45

46 47

One, is it based on substantial evidence in the record. Two, is it consistent with sound wildlife management practices. And, three, would it be detrimental to subsistence uses.

That third point has already come up in the discussion and that is if you give State sport hunters a better hunting opportunity than Federally qualified subsistence users, which this proposal would do until a Board of Game action changes it to a three caribou daily limit. Then you have to ask yourselves whether or not you're meeting those criteria in Section 805(c) that the Board would consider when considering your recommendation.

## CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would add, responding to Member Thomas's point and elaborating further on Carl Johnson's point just a moment ago. The potential to follow up and have a conversation or information sharing with the Northwest Arctic Council could help to address some of that conflict by making clear the potential for entertaining a proposal before the Board of Game.

Thank you.

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Now that being said, that makes more sense in justifying why OSM is opposed to it. We sat here and went round and round until you mentioned that. That makes a little more sense. So whether we be neutral or support it, it's coming from the people. That is my train of thought here. It's coming from the people. This is what they want, you know. Whether it's going to hurt them or not, we don't know until he mentioned that. So thank you for the clarification for that part.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm supportive of their line of reasoning, but I don't think that the method that they're using is going to be beneficial to them because somebody can fly over to the Kobuk, land the floatplane in the river, beach it on the sandbar, get out their Zodiac, drive around in the river and shoot five caribou, haul them back to their floatplane and fly away with them. Sport hunters are going to have this advantage of five caribou a day bag limit and the local people could do that. But if the caribou are on the land, they're limited to three caribou. If it's

wintertime, then they're limited to three caribou.

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

We have to work with these other Councils to work on a proposal to the agenda change request to the Board of Game if they want to do that really strongly, then we should help them do that through a call and then all the Councils submit that recommendation. The Board of Game might entertain that. It's up to them though.

10 11

12

13

14

17

18

19 2.0

21

22

23

24

27

2.8

29 30

31

34

37

MR. HONEA: Just one last comment. that brings up an interesting scenario here. In their defense, for their livelihood of whatever, we oppose their own proposal?

15 16

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, if we pass the proposal, then I'm going to have to go to the Federal Subsistence Board and support a proposal that's going to fail in the mind of the Federal Subsistence Board because they're going to look at it logically and go this doesn't help the people. The sport hunters can still kill five caribou a day in the river and so can the local residents, but it's a moot proposal for the majority of the time.

25 26

So I think there's a better way to do this. I think the Western Caribou Work Group, the Regional Councils could work towards an agenda change request with the Board of Game to address reducing the bag limit to three caribou per day. That's the way to do that.

32 33

MR. THOMAS: There is an avenue for them to do this.

35 36

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, there's an There's a way to do that, but this isn't the avenue. way to do it.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44 45

46 47

I don't really support the proposal because it's not going to work out. I don't want people to get their hopes up and then it like slaps them in the face. That's what's going to happen because there's still going to be people shooting caribou in the river, five of them every day. Overall harvest is not going to be significantly reduced with this proposal. If that's what they want to do, then they have to do it a different way.

48 49

```
Go ahead, Darrel.
 1
 2
 3
                     MR. VENT: Yeah, I like your idea of
     deferring the proposal or tabling it. It's up to them
 4
 5
     to make a decision. I think we discussed quite a bit
 6
     on this already. That was a good suggestion that you
 7
     made.
 8
 9
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have a motion
     on the floor to adopt. We can fail that motion -- how
10
     would we do that, to retract that motion? Carl. If we
11
     want to defer this proposal, what would be the
12
13
     procedure?
14
15
                     MR. JOHNSON: There's two ways to go.
     First, the original proponent with concurrence of the
16
17
     second could withdraw the motion. The other option
     would be the amend the existing motion to just
18
     completely change it to defer to the home region.
19
     Tabling it is not really an option because tabling
2.0
     requires future action at a meeting, which you don't
21
     have the opportunity to do.
22
23
2.4
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Chair will
25
     entertain a motion to amend the main motion to defer
     this proposal back to region. Tim.
26
27
                                   Jack, why don't you just
2.8
                     MR. GERVAIS:
29
     allow me to withdraw my motion.
30
31
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We'll go that
32
     way.
33
                     MR. GERVAIS: So I'll withdraw this
34
35
     motion....
36
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a
37
     concurrence with the second.
38
39
                     MR. GERVAIS: .....WP18-45.
40
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I missed the second
     on that one.(Pollock)
43
44
45
                     MR. VENT:
                                I seconded his motion.
                                                         That
46
     was me.
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Okay.
                                               So the main
     motion is withdrawn. The Chair will entertain a motion
49
50
```

Page 144 to defer WP18-45 to the region, to the proponent. 1 2 3 MR. VENT: I make a motion. 4 5 MS. PELKOLA: Second. 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion by Darrel, 8 seconded by Jenny. 9 Further discussion. 10 11 Carl. 12 13 MR. JOHNSON: I just wanted to 14 encourage the Council to have a good, clear statement. 15 There's been a lot of discussion as to the merits of 16 17 the proposal, but if you could clearly state on the record the reason why specifically you're not taking 18 action and deferring it to the home region. 19 20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll state for the 21 record that although the idea of reducing the daily bag 22 limit to three from five has viable aspects it will not 23 work on the ground. The effect of the regulation will 24 25 not have what the Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council is wanting. 26 27 The effect would be best with an agenda 2.8 change request of three caribou limit in conjunction 29 30 with the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council and Northwest Arctic Councils submitting that agenda change 31 request to the Board of Game, then submitting that as a 32 proposal so that the Board of Game changes it, then it 33 would be a redundancy into the system after that. 34 35 36 I want the record to be clear that I do not feel that this proposal will have the effect that 37 the Northwest Arctic is desiring. 38 39 Don. 40 41 42 MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair, I'm kind of 43 confused now. What exactly is the motion. 44 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The motion is to defer the proposal back to the region. 46 47 48 MR. HONEA: I call for the question. 49 50

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 10/10/2017 Page 145 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is 1 2 called. Those in favor of deferral of WP18-45 signify 3 by saying aye. 4 5 IN UNISON: Aye. 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign. 8 9 (No opposing votes) 10 MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman. 11 This guy over here, what the heck is your name? 12 13 14 MR. JOHNSON: Carl. 15 MR. THOMAS: The effect I thought of 16 17 tabling something is just put it to the side, forget about it. Now, what, you're saying that that isn't 18 what that tabling means? 19 20 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. 21 Usually when you table an action item it is tabled to 22 be brought up again at a future meeting. 23 24 25 MR. THOMAS: That it could be. 26 27 MR. JOHNSON: Typically you -procedurally you should. 2.8 29 30 MR. THOMAS: It's tabled. Okay, you just didn't want to deal with this, so you sat it to 31 the side. 32 33 34 MR. GERVAIS: You've got to deal with 35 it later if you table it. 36 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I'll just 37 point again for the record that the discussion that was 38 just stated was still a discussion as to why the 39 proposal should not be adopted, not why it should be 40 deferred. Just noting for the record. You were 41 addressing the merits of the value of the proposal. 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My reason being is 44 45 that I'm not willing to fight for the proposal because I think it's non-viable. I would like the record to 46 reflect that I would like a teleconference on this 47

48

49 50 issue to discuss what the main problem is and how to best achieve the remedy to that problem. I need this

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 10/10/2017 Page 146 conference with these other Councils. That's what we 1 2 need. We want them to understand we need to be able to talk to them so we all get on the same sheet of music 3 and we have the best effect with this proposal process. 5 It's fairly expensive to make these analyses and so 6 forth. 7 Tim. 8 9 MR. GERVAIS: Jack, maybe in the record 10 we could state that due to action taken earlier today 11 with trying to set up these caribou committees that 12 that's a better venue for dealing with this issue and 13 the topics surrounding it. 14 15 16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Exactly. 17 18 Ray. 19 2.0 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. using the term I and I think you should say we because 21 that's kind of a consensus of our discussion in the 22 minutes that would say we. 23 24 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I had a mouse in my pocket. 26 27 2.8 (Laughter) 29 30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Lisa. 31 MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 32 33 concludes all the caribou proposals, so we can go back to the order of all the other proposals. So that would 34 be WP18-21. 35 36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are they sequential 37 in this thing? 38 39 MS. MAAS: They should be in the order 40 41 that they're listed in the agenda. So 21 should be 42 after 18-35. 43 44 (Pause) 45 MS. MAAS: Are you ready, Mr. Chair? 46 47 48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Lisa.

MS. MAAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, for the record, my name is Lisa Maas and will be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal 18-21.

Wildlife Proposal 18-21 was submitted by the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and contains two request. First, that the harvest restrictions for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd in portions of Units 9, 17 and 19 be eliminated resulting in a simple harvest limit of 2 caribou and, second, to consolidate hunt areas. Specifically consolidation of hunt areas in Units 19 and 9C were requested. However, as no residents of the Western Interior Region have a customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Unit 9C, I will not present information about changes to that unit unless requested by this Council.

2.0

The proponent states that removal of the harvest restriction would provide greater harvest opportunity to Federally qualified subsistence users and would reduce regulatory complexity by aligning Federal regulations with recent changes to State regulations. Similarly, consolidation of hunt areas with identical seasons and harvest limits would simplify regulations.

Many changes to both State and Federal caribou regulations have occurred in these units over the past decade in response to caribou population dynamics and efforts to maintain alignment between Federal and State regulations, which includes this proposal.

In 2016, the State Board of Game eliminated caribou harvest restrictions in Units 9, 17 and 19, which this proposal also seeks to eliminate.

After peaking at 200,000 caribou in 1996, the Mulchatna Herd declined to a low of 18,000 in 2013. The most recent 2016 population estimate is 27,000 caribou, which is just below State management objectives. The 2016 bull/cow ratio of 39 bulls per 100 cows was the highest ratio observed since 2000.

Caribou are an important subsistence resource to local residents. Since 2000 reported harvest has decreased in response to declines in the Mulchatna Herd population. Reported harvest by local

hunters has averaged 430 caribou per year since 2000. However, since 2013 reported harvest by local hunters has only averaged 166 caribou per year, although unreported harvest occurs to an unknown degree.

Adopting this proposal would reduce regulatory complexity and user confusion by aligning Federal and State regulations. It would have no effect on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd or subsistence use as State regulations already adopted these changes. Consolidating hunt areas in Unit 19 would reduce regulatory complexity by simplifying Federal regulations and aligning them with State regulations.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support WP18-21 with modification to retain language in the Unit 19A and 19B regulation specifying that residents of Lime Village are authorized to hunt under an existing community hunt only as well as several modifications regarding the Unit 9C hunt area request.

Again, my presentation excluded information about requested changes to the Unit 9C hunt area as these changes are complicated and would not affect any Western Interior residents. Otherwise, Council action on this proposal may want to exclude the parts pertaining to Unit 9C.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: What's the current

harvest limit.

 It says change to two, but from what?

MS. MAAS: Through the Chair. It's removing harvest restriction. Currently the harvest limit is two caribou; however, no more than one caribou may be a bull and no more than one caribou may be taken August 1 to January 31st. So this proposal is removing those restrictions about when only one caribou can be taken and one caribou being a bull and just has a

simple harvest limit of two caribou.

1 2 3

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Thank you.

4 5

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions on the proposal.

6 7 8

(No comments)

9 10

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.

11 12

State comments.

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 2.0

21

22

23

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Department also supports this proposal. The Mulchatna Herd is showing signs of increase. It's very difficult to access this population. I think that's a really important point to make. The current reported harvest is less than 1 percent of the population size and we think that's actually accurate based on our radio tracking flights. It's largely occurring in areas that are not inhabited by the human population. Southwest Alaska has had very erratic snow cover, so winter travel has been very difficult for people.

24 25 26

27

2.8

29 30

31

32 33

So again we believe that the harvest is very minimal at this point. We have no conservation concerns. Obviously the State has already adopted this two caribou bag limit. We're currently meeting our bull to cow ratio objective. As was noted, we are below our population objective, but we see progress moving in that direction on an annual basis. The herd has really turned the corner from where it was. believe it's coming back.

34 35 36

37

38

39

I'd suggest it would be better to just align all the regulations in 19A and B and just make it all two caribou by permit using the State permit. think it would be most uniform for resource users and provide as much subsistence opportunity as possible.

40 41 42

43

44 45

46

47

If you do want to get into Unit 9, that's largely been a change in caribou herd distribution and the way things are being managed. you're familiar with the Board of Game proposals, we have a Board of Game proposal to try to clean that up relative to changes in herd distribution that have occurred since 1990.

48 49

So it's been a long time since the Northern Alaska Peninsula Herd has move north of the Naknek River into the northern portion of 9C. Largely it's been occupied by the Mulchatna Herd since 2000. So it's just saying it's treating the northern half of 9C as if it was part of the Mulchatna Herd range.

10

11

12

1 2

3

4 5

> So we definitely support that. going to see if we can't get it passed through the Board of Game and that will be February before the Federal Subsistence Board meets in April, so you'll have that information and knowledge piece as you go into the Federal Board of Game itself.

13 14 15

If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

The other thing to note is that we do have a predator control program that we've applied to this population to bolster it. We're going to be evaluating that this year. I think we're going to try to refocus the control effort so that they affect the calving areas more directly in the future. So we're making changes. We're continuing to adapt our management program essentially to provide future opportunities.

27 2.8

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29 30

31

32

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: These numbers are current, this herd population of 27,000-something or do you have numbers that are different than that, than what OSM had, 27,240?

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

MR. BUTLER: I just had that spreadsheet up. It's a joint Federal/State survey that's being conducted, so we had the same numbers that OSM has. Yeah, 27,242 is the current population estimate and 22 calves per 100 cows, 39 bulls per 100 cows. Again, everything seems to be looking good. think it's just a matter of time before it increases and hopefully continues to change its range as it increases. I think you noted that, that as the population increases it does change its range.

44 45 46

47 48

This herd from 1900 to 1980 was less than 20,000 caribou, so we're above what it was for the majority of the last century. For that period of time, for 80 years plus, it only occupied the Mulchatna River

Drainage in 17B. As it increased, it expanded out, started moving into Unit 18, 17C obviously, 17B, Unit 9 and Unit 19. So it started occupying a larger range. Probably the Kilbuck Mountain Herd got consumed in that expansion.

5 6 7

> 8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

1 2

3

4

Now that it's at a smaller population size, which again is still larger than it was for the majority of the 1900s, it's still occupying a fair bit of range. We think we have an eastern and a western segment. We're monitoring them to see what's going to happen, but both of them are largely inaccessible. western segment does get some harvest from Bethel during years where it's good in the eastern Unit 18, but it still seems to be a sustainable harvest for this population.

16 17 18

19

Are they still CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: broken into two calving aggregates now? Is that what you're referring to?

20 21 22

23 24

25

26

27

2.8

29 30

31

32

That's correct, yeah. MR. BUTLER: They're certainly interchanging the radio collars between the calving aggregations. One component we call the northern component is typically in the southern portion of Unit 19, so it wouldn't get all the way up to the Kuskokwim and may not be noticeable to residents of that unit, but they calve in the southern portion of Unit 19 and then move back quickly into the Mulchatna River Drainage in Unit 17 and Lake Clark area in Unit 9 before they head south. That segment typically winters closer to Dillingham and Koliganek. You see those villages.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

And then there's another segment of the population that we call the western segment that typically starts in Unit 17 with its calving closer to New Stuyahok, Koliganek, ironically, and then moves off to the west towards Unit 18 into the Kilbuck Mountain So we're watching both segments and seeing how they compare, but it appears that they're still acting as one herd due to interchange and things like that.

42 43 44

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I appreciate all that biological information and background.

45 46 47

MR. GERVAIS: A question.

48 49

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A question from Tim.

Go ahead.

1 2 3

MR. GERVAIS: What is the management objective for the herd?

MR. BUTLER: We have several management objectives, 30 to 80,000 I think is our population objective, 35 bulls per 100 cows is our ratio objective for males to females. We have objectives that go beyond that in terms of trying to apply intensive management and predator control. We like to see a certain proportion of calves survive into the fall, that sort of thing, to evaluate whether or not the predator control is effective.

2.8

But our underlying objectives again: minimum of 30,000 caribou, which we think we're increasing towards that objective and with these caribou herds some harvest is certainly appropriate and doesn't affect progress towards those objectives, so we feel pretty good about offering opportunity.

I think our current harvest is -- you know, a typically reported harvest is about anywhere from 100 to 200 caribou annually. We're estimating that we could take 1,400 caribou. So it really is just a fraction of even what is available for harvest. Less than 1 percent in the typical year what's reported. Again, despite all the concerns about reporting and other things, it probably is real just because this population is really withdrawn to areas that are very inaccessible and hard to access.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We had big concerns in Western Interior about that Mulchatna Herd decline and the high harvest rates that occurred previous to that on the bull component and the dismal effect that had on the herd. I'm glad to see that the herd bull/cow ratio has turned around and there's larger bulls in the population.

Is there non-resident hunting opportunity on Mulchatna?

MR. BUTLER: Not yet, Mr. Chair. It's still being managed for resident harvest opportunity.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm real happy to see this herd turning the corner. I think it can

Page 153 support this harvest that the Board of Game has 1 2 provided and I'm supportive of aligning this Federal hunt. I would like the Department to work with this 3 Council with providing herd status on an annual basis 4 5 if we can get that since we want to track what this 6 herd is actually doing. 7 8 MR. BUTLER: We'd be glad for the 9 opportunity, Mr. Chair. 10 11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. 12 Any further discussion with the State. 13 14 15 (No comments) 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Thanks so much, Lem. Federal manager discussion. 18 19 2.0 Bruce. 21 22 MR. SEPPI: Mr. Chair. Bruce Seppi, Anchorage Field Office BLM. We would support the 23 24 proposal as written. 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 26 Thank you. 27 Park Service, Lake Clark, comment. 2.8 29 30 (No comments) 31 32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. 33 Bristol Bay hasn't met yet. 34 35 Any written comments that you know of, 36 Zach? 37 MR. STEVENSON: None known at this 38 time, Mr. Chair. 39 40 41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Advisory committee 42 comments. 43 44 (No comments) 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any public 46 47 testimony. 48 Anybody on the phone care to speak to 49 50

Page 154 this proposal. 1 2 3 (No comments) 4 5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Regional Council 6 recommendation. 7 The Chair will entertain a motion to 8 9 adopt Proposal WP18-21 with OSM modification. 10 MR. THOMAS: I'll so move. 11 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Dennis. 14 15 MS. MAAS: Just to clarify, since we didn't really discuss the changes to Unit 9C if maybe 16 17 for the record you just say take no action on 9C or somehow clarify that you're not supporting the entire 18 proposal since we didn't discuss the Unit 9C 19 2.0 regulations. 21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The motion to adopt 22 the proposal excluding discussion on 9C for the record 23 to be clear. Dennis motioned to that effect. Do we 2.4 25 have a second. 26 MR. SIMON: Second. 27 2.8 29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock. 30 Discussion on Proposal 18-21. 31 32 (No comments) 33 34 MR. VENT: Call the question. 35 36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is called.... 37 38 MR. STEVENSON: Pardon me, Mr. Chair. 39 Just for point of clarification it may be helpful to 40 state the modification and the justification just so 41 that's clear for all parties. 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Where is the 44 45 modification? Oh, it's here. This is the discussion on 19C. 46 47 48 Go ahead there, Carl. 49 50

```
MR. JOHNSON: I think the motion
 1
     referencing the OSM modification has on the record what
 2
     the modification is. What's lacking from the record is
 3
     the Council's rationale for adopting that proposal as
 4
 5
     modified.
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        The presentation
     basically excluded 19C, modifications of delineation of
 8
 9
     where the North Peninsula Caribou Herd migrated and
     including that portion of 9C, but that's outside of our
10
     region. I don't want to muddy up the water with the
11
     modification. I would prefer to stay with the OSM
12
     modification. I agreed with their line of reasoning,
13
     but it's out of my region. So I'm just supporting the
14
     OSM modification, but we're not speaking to it
15
     specifically.
16
17
                     Is that clear.
18
19
2.0
                     I don't think it's going to affect the
     population for our region.
21
22
                     MR. JOHNSON: So what I'm hearing from
23
     you, Mr. Chair, is that the rationale behind the OSM
2.4
     preliminary conclusion you support that rationale.
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        T do.
27
2.8
29
                     MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I want to make the
31
32
     record crystal clear.
33
34
                     MR. COLLINS:
                                   Mr. Chairman, you've got
35
     a mouse again.
                     It's we do.
36
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
                                               Well, he
37
     asked me specifically. Any further discussion on the
38
39
     proposal as modified.
40
41
                     (No comments)
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Somebody call the
44
     question.
45
                     MS. PELKOLA:
                                   Ouestion.
46
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny called the
     question. Those in favor of Proposal WP18-21 with OSM
49
50
```

```
Page 156
     modification signify by saying aye.
 1
 2
 3
                      IN UNISON: Aye.
 4
                      CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.
 5
 6
 7
                      (No opposing votes)
 8
 9
                      CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal is adopted.
10
     It's 4:55 so we're going to recess until tomorrow
     morning and continue with our agenda.
11
12
                      We appreciate everybody being on the
13
     phone with us and the Department of Fish and Game.
14
15
                      (Off record)
16
17
                   (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```

Email: sahile@gci.net

1 2 3	CERTIFICATE
	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
4 5 6	STATE OF ALASKA )
7 8 9	I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
11 12 13 14 15	THAT the foregoing pages numbered through contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically on the 10th day of October in Fairbanks, Alaska;
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;
23 24 25	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.
26 27 28	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 18th day of October 2017.
29	
31 32	Salena A. Hile Notary Public, State of Alaska
33 34	My Commission Expires: 09/16/18
35 36	
37 38	
39 40	
41 42 43	
44 45	
46	
48 49	
50	